

CALIFORNIA MARINE LIFE PROTECTION ACT

MASTER PLAN for Marine Protected Areas

California Department of Fish & Game



Revised Draft
April 13, 2007

Deleted: July 21, 2006

=====Section Break (Next Page)=====

CONTENTS

Executive Summary.....	i
Section 1. Introduction.....	1
Early Years.....	2
Post World War II.....	3
California's Marine Heritage.....	4
Marine Life of California.....	6
Factors Affecting Marine Wildlife Populations.....	7
The Marine Life Management Act.....	8
Recent Developments.....	9
Marine Protected Areas Generally.....	10
MLPA Initiative Process.....	12
Roles in the Marine Life Protection Act Initiative.....	13
Organizational Partners, Committees, and Teams.....	13
Master Plan Framework.....	16
Section 2. Process for Designing Alternative Marine Protected Area Network Proposals.....	18
The Blue Ribbon Task Force MPA Design Process.....	19
Task 1: Regional MPA Planning.....	24
Activity 1.1: Convene regional process.....	26
Activity 1.2: Develop additional advice.....	27
Activity 1.3: Prepare regional profile.....	27
Activity 1.4: Determine key locations for MPAs to meet the MLPA goals within the region.....	28
Task 2: Assemble Draft Regional Alternative MPA Proposals.....	28
Activity 2.1: Recommend potential changes to existing MPAs.....	28
Activity 2.2: Assemble alternative MPA packages for the region.....	28
Task 3: Evaluate Alternative MPA Proposals.....	29
Activity 3.1: Evaluate alternative MPA proposals.....	29
Activity 3.2: Identify monitoring and evaluation indicators.....	29
Activity 3.3: Forward proposals to Commission.....	30
Task 4: Commission Consideration and Action.....	30
Activity 4.1: Commission review of proposals.....	30
Activity 4.2: Formal regulatory process.....	30
Activity 4.3: Public testimony.....	30
Activity 4.4: Commission acts on alternative regional MPA proposals.....	30
Section 3. Considerations in the Design of MPAs.....	31
Goals of the Marine Life Protection Program.....	31
MPA Networks.....	33
Science Advisory Team Guidance on MPA Network Design.....	34
Consideration of Habitats in the Design of MPAs.....	40
Species Likely to Benefit from MPAs.....	45
Biogeographical Regions.....	46
Types of MPAs.....	48
State Marine Reserve.....	49
State Marine Park.....	50
State Marine Conservation Area.....	50
State Marine Recreational Management Area.....	51
Combined use of marine reserves, marine parks and marine conservation areas.....	51
Levels of protection for MPA classification.....	51
Setting Goals and Objectives for MPAs.....	56
Enforcement and Public Awareness Considerations in Setting Boundaries.....	59
Information Supporting the Design of MPAs.....	60
Other Programs and Activities Other Than Fishing.....	61

Deleted: 11

Deleted: 15

Deleted: 26

Deleted: 26

Deleted: Develop regional ecological and socioeconomic goals, objectives and design ¶ considerations 27¶
Activity 1.5:

Deleted: 27

Deleted: Packages

Deleted: Package

Deleted: 28

Deleted: 28

Deleted: alternative package proposals to the Department 29¶
Activity 3.4: Submit

Deleted: 29

Deleted: July 21, 2006

Section 4. Management.....	64	
Structure of regional MPA management plans	65	
Description of major elements.....	66	
Section 5. Enforcement.....	70	
Existing Enforcement Assets	70	
MPA Enforcement Considerations.....	72	
Enforcement Plan Objectives.....	73	
Section 6. Monitoring and Adaptive Management of MPAs.....	75	
Developing a Monitoring and Evaluation Program for MPAs and Network Components.....	76	
Section 7. Funding.....	82	Deleted: 83
MLPA funding history	82	Deleted: 83
Blue Ribbon Task Force input on funding.....	83	Deleted: 85
Appropriate Sources of Funds	84	Deleted: 87
Expected activities required to implement the MLPA	84	Deleted: 88
Possible partners in funding or performing activities required to implement the MLPA	86	Deleted: 89
Expected duration and levels of expenditures	86	Deleted: 89
Structures for receipt and allocation of funds.....	87	Deleted: 89
Section 8. Regional MPA Management Plans.....	88	Deleted: 89
8.1: North Coast Region (California/Oregon border to Alder Creek near Point Arena).....	88	Deleted: Planned Completion 2011¶
Timeline to be Determined		Deleted: 89
8.2: North-Central Coast Region (Alder Creek near Point Arena to Pigeon Point)	88	Deleted: 89
Planned Completion 2009		Deleted: 89
8.3: San Francisco Bay Region (Waters within San Francisco Bay)	88	Deleted: Planned Completion 2010¶
Timeline to be Determined		Deleted: 89
8.4: Central Coast Region (Pigeon Point to Point Conception)	88	Deleted: 89
8.4.1 Introduction	88	Deleted: 89
Description of region	88	Deleted: 89
Regional design and implementation considerations.....	91	Deleted: 89
Regional goals, and objectives	92	Deleted: 89
Description of individual MPA boundaries (including maps), regulations, and objectives	94	Deleted: 93
8.4.2. General Activities and Locations	136	Deleted: 134
Baseline Scientific Monitoring and Research plan	136	Deleted: 134
Long-term and Ongoing Monitoring Plan	141	Deleted: 161
Outreach, Interpretation and Education plan.....	171	Deleted: 161
Enforcement plan.....	171	Deleted: 161
8.4.3. Operations	176	Deleted: Contingencies and Emergency Planning 163¶
Equipment and Facilities	176	Deleted: 163
Staffing.....	176	Deleted: 163
Collaborations and Potential Partnerships	177	Deleted: 163
8.4.4. Costs and Funding.....	178	Deleted: 163
Estimated costs	178	Deleted: 163
Potential funding sources	178	Deleted: 163
8.4.5. Timelines and Milestones	178	Deleted: 163
Timeline and Criteria for Implementation	178	Deleted: 163
Timeline for Evaluation and Review of Effectiveness.....	178	Deleted: 163
8.5: South Coast Region (Point Conception to U.S./Mexico Border)	178	Deleted: 163
Timeline to be Determined		Deleted: 164
Literature Cited.....	179	Deleted: 164
List of Figures		Deleted: 164
Figure 1. Players in the Marine Life Protection Act Initiative	13	Deleted: 164
Figure 2. Process for MPA planning in study regions	21	Deleted: Planned Completion 2008¶
Figure 3. Flowchart of the review process to determine if individual, regional, and MLPA goals are being met by the various types of MPAs and other management measures	32	Deleted: 165
Figure 4. An example of sea surface temperature in the California coastal waters, May 30, 2000	43	Deleted: 20
Figure 5. Flowchart of process to establish and conduct a monitoring program.....	78	Deleted: July 21, 2006

Figure 6. Año Nuevo State Marine Reserve and Greyhound Rock State Marine Conservation Area.....	97
Figure 7. <u>Natural Bridges State Marine Reserve</u>	100
Figure 8. Elkhorn Slough State Marine Reserve, Elkhorn Slough State Marine Park, and Morro Cojo Lagoon State Marine Reserve	102
Figure 9. Soquel Canyon State Marine Conservation Area and Portuguese Ledge State Marine Conservation Area	105
Figure 10. <u>Edward F. Ricketts State Marine Conservation Area, Lovers Point State Marine Reserve, and Pacific Grove State Marine Conservation Area</u>	108
Figure 11. Carmel Pinnacles State Marine Conservation Area, Carmel Bay State Marine Conservation Area, Point Lobos State Marine Reserve, and Point Lobos State Marine Conservation Area.....	113
Figure 12. Pt. Sur State Marine Reserve and Pt. Sur State Marine Conservation Area.....	118
Figure 13. Big Creek State Marine Reserve and Big Creek State Marine Conservation Area	121
Figure 14. Piedras Blancas State Marine Reserve and Piedras Blancas State Marine Conservation Area.....	125
Figure 15. Cambria State Marine <u>Park and Cambria State Marine Reserve</u>	127
Figure 16. Morro Bay State Marine Reserve and Morro Bay State Marine Recreational Management Area with no-take portion of the SMRMA indicated.....	130
Figure 17. Pt. Buchon State Marine Reserve and Pt. Buchon State Marine Conservation Area including the Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant Safety Zone	133
Figure 18. Vandenberg State Marine Reserve	136

List of Tables

Table 1: Process for MPA planning in study regions.....	22
Table 2: Comparison of potential marine protected area goals	59
Table 3. Central coast enforcement personnel with marine emphasis (2005)	71
Table 4. Natural Resource Enforcement Assets in California	72
Table 5. Central coast MPA <u>objectives that will be met by adoption and implementation of the MPA</u>	147
Table 6. <u>Central coast MPA</u> monitoring activities based upon MLPA Goals and individual MPA objectives	149
Table 7. <u>MPAs with deep water (> 30 m) hard bottom habitat (area in mi²)</u>	158
Table 8. <u>Focal fish and invertebrate species for deep water (> 30m) hard bottom habitats</u>	158
Table 9. <u>MPAs with shallow water (< 30m) hard bottom habitat (area in mi²)</u>	160
Table 10. <u>Focal fish and invertebrate species for shallow water (< 30m) hard bottom habitats</u>	161
Table 11. <u>MPAs with mid and deep water (>30 m) soft bottom habitat (area in mi²)</u>	162
Table 12. <u>Focal fish and invertebrate species for mid and deep water (> 30 m) soft bottom habitats</u>	163
Table 13. <u>MPAs with rocky intertidal habitat (area in mi²)</u>	164
Table 14. <u>Focal fish and invertebrate species for intertidal hard bottom habitats</u>	164
Table 15. <u>Focal marine birds and mammals</u>	165
Table 16. <u>MPAs with coastal marsh and estuary habitat (area in mi²)</u>	167
Table 17. <u>Focal species for estuaries</u>	167
Table 18. <u>Enforcement considerations for central coast region MPAs</u>	172
Table 19 <u>Central coast enforcement personnel with marine emphasis (August 2006)</u>	174
Table 20. <u>Existing data collection efforts which may provide information or potential collaboration in the Central Coast study region</u>	177

Appendices (a separate document)

- A. The Marine Life Protection Act
- B. The Marine Managed Areas Improvement Act
- C. Implementation of the Marine Life Protection Act: 1999-2004
- D. Strategy for Stakeholder and Interested Public Participation
- E. Social Science Tools and Methods
- F. Outline of Information Required for Proposals for Alternative Networks of Marine Protected Areas
- G. Master List of Species Likely to Benefit from Marine Protected Areas
- H. Summary of Recent and Ongoing Processes Related to the Marine Life Protection Act Initiative

Deleted: 100

Deleted: 8

Deleted: 103

Deleted: 9. Ed

Deleted: Hopkins

Deleted: 106

Deleted: 10

Deleted: 110

Deleted: 11

Deleted: 116

Deleted: 12

Deleted: 119

Deleted: 13

Deleted: 123

Deleted: 14

Deleted: 126

Deleted: 15

Deleted: East

Deleted: 128

Deleted: 16

Deleted: 131

Deleted: 17

Deleted: 134

Deleted: Figure 18. Description of Structural Tiers 135¶

Deleted: 21

Deleted: 137

Deleted: Table 6. Enforcement considerations for central coast region MPAs


Deleted: July 21, 2006

- Peer review of SAT guidelines for developing networks of MPAs and of the application of those guidelines in evaluating proposed packages
- Department staff
- Commission


Figure 1 portrays the links among the various players in the initiative process including changes made to this process subsequent to the central coast study region (2004-2006). See Appendix D for a description of stakeholder participation strategies.

Deleted: July 21, 2006

Figure 1. Players in the Marine Life Protection Act Initiative.



Note: input is solicited from the interested public and stakeholders at each step, until adoption of regulations by the Commission.



Roles in the Marine Life Protection Act Initiative

Organizational Partners, Committees, and Teams

The Commission is the ultimate decision-making authority for implementation of the MLPA. Specifically, the Commission makes all final decisions on the master plan, the proposed regional marine protected area proposals, and supporting CEQA documentation, all after completing its own process of public reviews. The principal mission of the other partners is to support the Commission in making sound policy decisions required by the MLPA. Although the Commission was not involved in the day-to-day work of the MLPA Initiative, the initiative provided regular opportunities for informational meetings and strategic consultation with the Commission. Commission staff also became active participants in the steering committee planning process subsequent to the first regional process (see below).

The California Resources Agency provides general oversight and public leadership for the initiative and implementation of the MLPA. Besides providing policy direction for coordinating funding and staffing, the agency made critical decisions in shaping the initiative. The secretary of the California Resources Agency selected the chair and other members of the MLPA Blue Ribbon Task Force. The secretary convened and charged the members of the task force with meeting the objectives identified in the task force description below. The California Resources Agency is also seeking adequate current and future funding for agency and Department personnel committed to the initiative and for completing future phases of the MLPA. Agency staff also became active participants in the steering committee planning process subsequent to the first regional process (see below).

The Department serves as the lead agency for the design and implementation of the MLPA master plan and a statewide network of marine protected areas. The Department continues its traditional support of the Resources Agency and the Commission. In consultation with the Agency secretary, the Commission president, and the task force chair, the Director of the Department selected the members of the science team. Through the initiative's Steering Committee (described below), the Department assisted the development of the draft master plan framework and proposals for marine protected areas along the central coast, and is ultimately responsible for presenting the final draft master plan and comments on the Blue Ribbon Task Force's alternatives for marine protected areas in each region, including preferred alternatives for each region, to the Commission. The Department also provides biological, enforcement and other relevant information, participates in meetings as appropriate, reviews working documents, and acts as lead agency under the California Environmental Quality Act, among other activities.

Deleted: director

Deleted: a

The MLPA Blue Ribbon Task Force is composed of distinguished, knowledgeable and highly credible public leaders selected by the secretary of the California Resources Agency. The charge to the task force in the first study region (the central California coast between Pigeon Point and Point Conception) was to oversee the preparation of the draft master plan framework and the development of alternative proposals for marine protected areas in an area along the central coast for the Department to present to the Commission; to prepare a comprehensive strategy for long-term funding of planning, management and enforcement of marine protected areas; and to develop recommendations for improved coordination of managing marine

Deleted: July 21, 2006

protected areas with federal agencies involved in ocean management. The task force also worked to resolve policy disputes and provide direction in the face of uncertainty, while meeting the objectives of the MLPA. The chair of the task force selected the executive Director of the MLPA Initiative, who in turn selected the senior MLPA project manager, operations & communications manager, and central coast MLPA project manager; worked with the Director of the Department to convene and direct the science team; and served as the principal link between the task force and initiative staff. Several task force members served as liaisons to the central coast project. In subsequent study regions task force members will provide ongoing policy guidance and advice as well as oversee the preparation of MPA alternatives and selecting a preferred alternative in each study region.

Deleted: director

Deleted: director

The Resources Legacy Fund Foundation uses its best efforts to obtain, coordinate and administer philanthropic investments to supplement public funding for the MLPA Initiative, provides strategic advice to the California Resources Agency on public-private funding, and supported the initiative staff in managing private contracts for the initiative.

Deleted: used

Other state and federal agencies played a variety of roles in the initiative. For instance, federal agencies, such as NOAA Fisheries, the National Ocean Service, and the National Marine Sanctuary Program, are valuable sources of information and may have programs that should be taken into account in designing regional MPAs. State agencies may play a similar role.

The Director of the Department, in consultation with the chair of the task force, the secretary of the agency, and the president of the Commission, convenes a Master Pan Science Advisory Team (science team) for each study region process. The science team is composed of the members required by the MLPA, including staff from the Department, the Department of Parks and Recreation, the State Water Resources Control Board, one member appointed from a list provided by Sea Grant, and an expanded group of scientists knowledgeable in marine ecology, fisheries science, marine protected areas, economics and the social sciences. The role of the science team is to assist the task force in developing the draft master plan framework by reviewing supporting and draft documents, addressing scientific issues, and framing and referring policy challenges to the task force. The science team reports to the Department Director and provides input to the task force.

Deleted: director

Deleted: convened the

Deleted:)

Deleted: was

Deleted: was

Deleted: reported to the task force

Deleted: the director of the Department

Deleted: the central coast

A sub-team of the science team serves each study region project. The Science Advisory Sub-Team for the central coast region was composed of members of the science team, and worked with the central coast project manager and central coast stakeholder group to develop alternative marine protected area proposals by reviewing supporting and draft documents, addressing scientific issues and information provided by the central coast stakeholder group, and framing and referring policy challenges to the task force. At least one member of the science sub-team attended each central coast stakeholder group meeting. This group continued to assist the Department in reviewing and analyzing MPA packages for the central coast throughout the alternative development process. In subsequent study regions, the science team similarly designates a sub-team to work directly with the stakeholders and Department to help develop scientifically sound alternatives.

Deleted: continues

Deleted: included

Deleted: central coast

Deleted: were

Deleted: director

Deleted: July 21, 2006

The MLPA Regional Stakeholder Group includes key, affected members of the current study region who are able and willing to provide information that assisted in the development of proposed alternative network components of marine protected areas. The Director of the

Department and the central coast liaison of the task force solicit nominations, and select from the nominees a representative group that meet regularly over the course of the regional process to provide input to the regional project manager, provide information and other input for framing key scientific questions to be addressed by the science advisory sub-team, and worked as a group to develop alternative proposals for MPAs. The Department provides enforcement, biological, and policy staff support to the group for information and input on key issues.

Deleted: ed

Deleted: ed

Deleted: met

Deleted: provided

Deleted: enforcement

The MLPA Statewide Interests Group is composed of members from key interest groups to advise the task force and staff on the overall MLPA Initiative process. The group does not vote or otherwise take formal positions on any procedural or substantive issues, but instead alerted the task force and staff to issues and opportunities that could improve public involvement in the initiative process.

Deleted: was

Deleted: did

The MLPA Steering Committee is chaired by the MLPA Initiative's executive Director, and in the first regional process included the Department's MLPA policy advisor, statewide technical advisor, MPA mandate coordinator, and central coast regional coordinator, and the Initiative's senior project manager, operations & communications manager, and central coast project manager. The committee was responsible for coordinating all work necessary to achieve each of the objectives of the initiative.

Deleted: was

Deleted: director

Deleted: initiative's

In subsequent study regions, the steering committee was expanded based on the experience in the central coast process. Members now include the Initiative's executive Director, senior project manager, and operations and communications manager; the Department's MPA policy advisor and MPA project supervisor; and representatives from the Resources Agency and Fish and Game Commission. This more comprehensive steering committee is designed to ensure that all policy issues in the regional process are quickly and adequately portrayed to the primary oversight and decision makers in the process.

Other Staff

Both the MLPA Initiative and Department hire, and contract, a variety of other staff to help support the initiative process. Examples of these staff included biological technicians, scientific advisors, research writers, and administrative support staff. The Department, after the first study region process was complete, received significant increases in staff through the state budget process to support the implementation of the MLPA. These positions were filled in late 2006 to create a new organizational component within the Department's Marine Region. This group of new staff will support planning and implementation in all study regions.

Deleted: d

Deleted: ed

Deleted: In other regions, similar levels of staffing, preferably within the

Deleted: will be necessary to properly support the planning

Master Plan Framework and Master Plan

The MLPA calls for the development of a master plan by the Department, and its adoption by the Commission³. The MLPA Initiative divided the master plan into two principal parts: a section providing guidance in the application of the MLPA to the development of a statewide MPA network (the master plan framework), and a section describing the preferred alternatives for MPA proposals. The MLPA Initiative envisioned a focus on portions of the state in a series

³ The Fish and Game Code requires the Department to provide a draft master plan to the Commission by January 2005 and the Commission to adopt a final master plan with regulations by December 2005 [Section 2859, FGC].

Deleted: July 21, 2006

Section 2. Process for Designing Alternative Marine Protected Area Network Proposals

For practical reasons, the MLPA required review and improvement of the existing array of MPAs and ensuring that California's MPAs function as a network cannot be established in a single step. The resources and effort required to design and evaluate MPAs along the state's entire 1,100-mile coast at the same time are beyond the capacity of both governmental and non-governmental resources. In addition, ecological, social and economic conditions differ widely among many regions.

Deleted: mandated

A sound master plan based on the requirements of the MLPA should enable application of the MLPA to differing conditions while maintaining a statewide perspective. For these and other reasons, this master plan envisions that the statewide network will be assembled by establishing MPAs in each of several study regions along the coast by 2011. Once established, the management, research, education, and monitoring in each region can be coordinated statewide.

The master plan framework was first applied to developing alternative proposals in the central coast study region. Critical to understanding this process were several concepts and definitions. The "central coast study region" was the first general area under consideration for the design of MPAs. By no means was the entire region expected to be designated an MPA. Rather, after review of the circumstances within the region, including existing MPAs and the setting of regional design considerations, goals and objectives, alternatives for the region were developed.

Equally important, this study region was smaller than the "biogeographical regions" defined in the MLPA. It is the biogeographical regions that are the basis for determining the number of marine reserves as required by the MLPA for replicates of similar habitats within marine reserves.

Within the first study region, existing regulations (including existing MPAs), the status of the resources and habitats, and the requirements of the MLPA were considered. Regional goals, objectives and design considerations were then developed, followed by potential goals and objectives for individual MPAs. Possible boundaries and regulations were then identified for individual MPAs in the region, including alternative designs and potential changes to or removal of existing MPAs.

This variety of approaches to configuring MPAs within the central coast region was assembled into alternative proposals. These alternatives were considered by the task force, and a subset was recommended to the Department. The Department ensured these alternatives were feasible, selected a preferred alternative, and formally presented the alternatives to the Commission.

Deleted: ¶
This variety of approaches to configuring MPAs within the region was assembled into alternative proposals. These alternatives were considered by the task force, and a subset was recommended to the Department. The Department ensured these alternatives were feasible, selected a preferred alternative, and formally presented the alternatives to the Commission.¶

Deleted: —Page Break—

In subsequent study regions, the task force will select a preferred alternative and, rather than creating or selecting a separate preferred alternative, the Department will provide specific comments on the task force preferred. This will ensure the recommendations developed in the detailed stakeholder involvement process will be fully considered at every stage. The Department's comments on the preferred, coupled with a more central role in the alternative

Deleted: July 21, 2006

development process, will ensure that all alternatives forwarded to the Commission are feasible.

The Blue Ribbon Task Force MPA Design Process

The MPA design process is composed of four general activities:

1. **Regional MPA planning**, which starts with the identification of a study region along the coast that constitutes a logical locale based on a variety of scientific and socioeconomic criteria for studying where MPAs might appropriately be placed. Much of this background information is assembled into a regional profile. A regional stakeholder group is then established for the selected region. This step ends with an evaluation of existing MPAs and other management measures, initial discussion of areas of ecological importance and human use interest, and refinement of the regional profile.

Deleted: the identification of regional goals and objectives,

2. **Assembling alternative MPA proposals**, which involves developing and refining alternative MPA proposals for the study region. Development of alternative MPA proposals is informed by: a) information provided in the regional profile; b) guidance on developing MPAs which satisfy the MLPA provided by the Science Advisory Team and adopted by the Commission; c) the Department's written guidance on feasibility criteria; d) contributions of members of the regional stakeholder group; and e) contributions provided from other sources, including interested parties, potentially affected stakeholders and public comments. This stage also includes an initial evaluation of the proposals, including socioeconomic effects, and a feasibility study to determine whether proposals can be implemented.

Deleted: packages of MPAs

Deleted: This stage also includes an initial evaluation of the proposals, including socioeconomic effects, and a feasibility study to determine whether proposals can be implemented.¶

Evaluating alternative MPA proposals, which begins with initial evaluation by the task force or

Deleted: . The task force then forwards the package of alternative proposals to

Deleted: , or the Commission provides direction to the Department, which reviews the proposals, selects a preferred alternative

Deleted: prepares a general management plan

Deleted: in the region..


During this stage regional goals and objectives developed in earlier study regions are assessed and revised as needed for subsequent study regions. As proposed MPA alternatives are finalized, information on how each MPA contributes to the goals and objectives will be developed and incorporated into the proposals for MPAs. The Department actively supports this development and refinement of MPA proposals, bringing its information and perspectives into the process both verbally and in written comments.

3. **Evaluating alternative MPA proposals**, which begins with initial evaluation by the task force based on the information described in step 2 above. The task force then forwards the package of alternative proposals and its recommendation of a preferred alternative to the Commission. As the recommendations regarding proposed MPAs and a recommended preferred alternative are provided to the Commission, the Department provides information, analyses and comments to the Commission on feasibility of aspects of the MPA proposals and on the prospects of the MPA proposals to achieve the goals of the MLPA.

4. **Fish and Game Commission consideration and action on MPA proposals**, which includes public hearings, consideration of testimony and action on the proposals.

Deleted: July 21, 2006

Figure 2. Process for MPA planning in study regions.



Note that during steps 2 and 3, the Department, BRTF, Science Team, Commission and other groups will participate in review and evaluation of potential alternatives.

Deleted: July 21, 2006 Page

Table 1: Process for MPA planning in study regions.

Key to acronyms: BRTF = Blue Ribbon Task Force; CEQA = California Environmental Quality Act; DFG = Department of Fish and Game; FGC = Fish and Game Commission; RSG = Regional Stakeholder Group; SAT = Science Advisory Team; SST = Science Advisory Sub-team.

	TASK	LEAD ACTORS	SUGGEST/COMMENT
REGIONAL MPA PLANNING			
1.1	Convene regional process		
1.1.1	Convene regional stakeholder group (RSG)	DFG Director/BRTF Chair	Stakeholders
1.1.2	Appoint science advisory team (SAT)	DFG Director	Stakeholders
1.1.3	Select science advisory sub-team (SST)	SAT/DFG	
1.2	Develop additional advice		
1.2.1	Identify issues requiring additional advice for designing MPAs in the study region	RSG/SST/DFG	Stakeholders/SAT
1.2.2	Collect and prepare additional advice for designing MPAs in the study region	DFG/SST	RSG/Stakeholders
1.2.3	Review additional advice for designing MPAs in the study region	BRTF/FGC/SAT	RSG/Stakeholders
1.2.4	Adopt additional advice for designing MPAs in the study region	BRTF	
1.2.5	Prepare statement of feasibility criteria	DFG	
1.3	Prepare regional profile		
1.3.1	Assemble regional information on biological, oceanographic, socioeconomic, and governance aspects of the region	DFG	RSG/Stakeholders
1.3.2	Evaluate existing MPAs against goals and objectives	DFG/SAT	RSG/Stakeholders
1.3.3	Evaluate existing fishing and non-fishing management activities against the MLPA, regional goals and objectives, and other relevant state law	DFG/SAT	RSG/Stakeholders
1.3.4	Identify inadequacies, if any, in existing MPAs and management	DFG/SAT	RSG/Stakeholders
1.3.5	Review regional information and consider comments from stakeholders	RSG/SST	Stakeholders
1.3.6	Identify a list of key or critical species and document their regional distribution	SST	Stakeholders
1.4	Determine key locations for MPAs to meet the MLPA goals within the region	RSG/SST	DFG/SAT/Stakeholders
1.4.1	Evaluate distribution of representative and unique habitats	RSG/SST	Stakeholders
1.4.2	Evaluate wildlife populations, habitats, and uses of concern	RSG/SST	Stakeholders
1.4.3	Evaluate activities affecting populations and habitats within the region	RSG/SST	Stakeholders
1.4.4	Identify species likely to benefit that are of particular concern to the region	RSG/SST	Stakeholders

Deleted: and science advisory team (SAT)

Deleted: Select

Deleted: sub-

Deleted: SST)

Deleted: SAT/

Deleted: Develop regional ecological and socioeconomic goals, objectives and design considerations

Deleted: Design regional goals, objectives and design considerations consistent with the MLPA and other relevant state law

Deleted: Review regional goals, objectives and design considerations

Deleted: BRTF/FGC/SAT

Deleted: Approve regional goals, objectives and design considerations

Deleted: BRTF

... [1]

Deleted: California Marine Life Protection Act Initiative Final Draft Master Plan Framework¶

Deleted: 4, 2005

Deleted: ¶

1.4.5	<u>Identify key locations in the region where MPAs may help achieve the MLPA goals and contribute to an overall network</u>	RSG/SST	Stakeholders
ASSEMBLE DRAFT REGIONAL ALTERNATIVE MPA PROPOSALS			
2.1	Consider potential changes to existing MPAs	RSG/SST	DFG/SAT/Stakeholders
2.1.1	Consider potential modifications to existing MPAs and potential new and alternative MPAs for meeting goals and objectives of the region, the MLPA, and of other relevant state law	RSG/SST	Stakeholders
2.2	Assemble <u>draft</u> alternative MPA <u>proposals</u> for the region	RSG/SST	Stakeholders
2.2.1	<u>Prepare a range of alternative proposals including a variety of MPAs within the region in order to achieve the goals and objectives based on the design considerations for the region.</u>	RSG/ <u>SST</u>	Stakeholders
2.2.2	<u>Identify objectives for each existing and potential new MPA</u>	RSG	<u>SST/SAT</u> /Stakeholders
2.2.3	Present this range of alternatives along with justification for each to the BRTF and SAT for review	RSG	
EVALUATE ALTERNATIVE MPA PROPOSALS			
3.1	Evaluate alternative MPA proposals against the MLPA and other relevant state law	BRTF/ <u>FGC</u>	Stakeholders
3.1.1	Prepare preliminary habitat, size, and spacing analysis of each alternative proposal	SAT/SST	Stakeholders
3.1.2	Prepare preliminary socio-economic analysis of potential impacts of each alternative proposal	SAT/SST/DFG	Stakeholders
3.1.3	Review SST analyses and revise proposals as needed to more fully meet the goals, objectives and design considerations	RSG	
3.2	Identify monitoring and evaluation indicators	SST/SAT	DFG
3.3	Forward <u>recommended</u> alternative proposals <u>and recommended preferred alternative to the Commission for consideration and action</u>	BRTF	
3.3.1	Conduct feasibility analysis to ensure proposals may be implemented	DFG	RSG/BRTF
3.3.2	<u>Provide comments on BRTF recommendations to Commission</u>	DFG	RSG/ <u>BRTF</u> /Stakeholders
3.3.3	<u>Design general management plan for MPAs in the region, including monitoring, enforcement, outreach and financing, with a periodic review of effectiveness</u>	DFG/ <u>SAT</u>	RSG/Stakeholders
COMMISSION CONSIDERATION AND ACTION			

Deleted: Determine
Deleted: for
Deleted: to meet
Deleted: within the region
Deleted: DFG/SAT/
Deleted: 1.5.1 ... [2]
Deleted: Identify objectives for each existing and potential new MPA
Deleted: Prepare a range of alternative proposals including a variety of MPAs within the region in order to achieve the goals and objectives based on the design considerations for the region.
Deleted: or Commission
Deleted: Department
Deleted: submission to FGC
Deleted: Prepare preferred alternative based upon information submitted by BRTF, RSG, and other stakeholders
... [3]
Deleted: PACKAGES
Deleted: packages
Deleted: /SST
Deleted: Design general management plan for MPAs in the region, including monitoring, enforcement, and financing, with a periodic review of effectiveness
Deleted: /SAT
Deleted: SST/SAT/
Deleted: SAT/
Deleted: July 21, 2006

- Moderate = 100-150 miles
- Low = less than 100 miles
- Availability of Department personnel. The same considerations relative to travel that apply to the regional stakeholder group would also apply to Department staff.

A list of potential initial study regions was prepared and input was taken from the public both at BRTF meetings and at three public workshops in 2005. Specific areas of agreement among the majority of comments were noted. In addition, specific areas of concern became apparent. From this, a set of three potential initial study regions was developed. The positive and negative aspects of each potential region were presented to the BRTF, which then selected the final initial study region of Pigeon Point to Point Conception based on the information provided.

The same criteria used to determine the initial study region have been applied to the rest of the California coast. Using these criteria and the lessons learned from the initial central coast region provides a good format for completing implementation throughout the California coast. Accordingly, the following timeline is recommended for statewide planning:

Region 1: Central Coast Region (Pigeon Point to Point Conception) - Planning within this initial region was completed in 2006

Region 2: North-Central Coast Region (Point Arena to Pigeon Point) - Planned completion in 2009

Other Regions: South Coast Region (Point Conception to U.S./Mexico border), San Francisco Bay Region (Waters within the San Francisco Bay District as defined in CCR, Title 14, Section 27.00), North Coast Region (California/Oregon border to Point Arena).

Implementation dates for MPAs within each region will be dependent upon acquiring appropriate levels of staff and funding to adequately manage, monitor, and enforce each area. Within each region, detailed management plans (described below) will provide specific plans and budgets for these critical activities.

Activity 1.1: Convene regional planning process

Activity 1.1.1: The Director of the Department and chair of the BRTF convenes a regional stakeholder group to participate in the evaluation of the region and existing management, and potential changes to existing MPAs and the design of any additional MPAs.

Activity 1.1.2: The Director of the Department convenes a science advisory team with desired membership of not more than 15 members. The science team will participate in evaluation of draft MPA proposals and provide scientific input and guidance to the Department for use in the BRTF regional planning process.

Activity 1.1.2: The science team and Department identify members who will serve on a science sub-team, which will work closely with the regional stakeholder group, and will serve as a link to the science team.

Activity 1.2: Develop additional advice

Deleted: South Coast Region (Point Conception to U.S./Mexico border) - Planned completion in 2008¶
Region 3:

Deleted: 4:

Deleted:) - Planned completion in 2010¶
Region 5:

Deleted: - Planned completion in 2011

Deleted: ¶
The above provides a planning timeline, which may differ from the timeline of actual implementation.

Deleted: director

Deleted: and science advisory team

Deleted: regional goals and objectives

Deleted: July 21, 2006

Activity 1.2.1: The regional stakeholder group, the science advisory sub-team, and staff identify issues requiring additional advice for designing MPAs in the study region.

Activity 1.2.2: In consultation with the science advisory sub-team, staff prepares draft advice on these issues.

Activity 1.2.3: The task force, Commission and science team review additional advice for designing MPAs in the study region.

Deleted: the

Activity 1.2.4: The task force acts on the additional advice and incorporates it into planning and guidance documents.

Deleted: the

Deleted: or Commission

Deleted: .

Activity 1.2.5: The Department prepares a statement of feasibility criteria and provides it to the BRTF, RSG, and science team. This statement will provide overarching guidance on critical features of MPA proposals that make them realistically able to be implemented if adopted.

Activity 1.3: Prepare regional profile

Activity 1.3.1: Staff assemble regional information on biological, oceanographic, socioeconomic and governance aspects and draw upon suggestions and information provided by local communities and other stakeholders. The profile will include governance aspects related to tribal uses in the region if applicable. See Appendix E for a description of social science tools and methods. The types of the information that might be included in a regional profile may be found in Appendix F.

Activity 1.3.2: Within the profile, staff evaluate existing MPAs in the study region. This preliminary analysis will include a review of existing studies within each MPA and a determination of whether the areas are meeting their original goals as well as whether they may achieve regional goals and MLPA requirements.

Activity 1.3.3: Within the profile, staff evaluate existing management of fishing and non-fishing activities (e.g., Rockfish Conservation Areas or trawl fishery closures, etc.). Where this other management meets the goals and objectives of the MLPA in all or part of the region, it should be incorporated into the final design.

Activity 1.3.4: Within the profile, staff identify inadequacies in existing MPAs and management activities in meeting the goals and objectives of the MLPA. (See Appendix H for a description of planning processes related to the MLPA.)

Activity 1.3.5: The regional stakeholder group and the science sub-team review regional information and consider comments from stakeholders.

Activity 1.3.6: Drawing upon the list of species likely to benefit from protection within MPAs described in Appendix G, the science advisory sub-team develops a list of key or critical species and document their regional distribution.

Deleted: July 21, 2006

Activity 1.4: Determine key locations for MPAs to meet the MLPA goals within the region.

Activity 1.4.1: The regional stakeholder group and the science advisory sub-team evaluate the distribution of representative and unique habitats in the region, based on the information assembled in Activity 1.3, and information provided by stakeholders, including local communities and resource users.

Activity 1.4.2: The regional stakeholder group and the science advisory sub-team identify and evaluate wildlife populations, habitats, and various human uses that may negatively impact the populations and habitats in the region.

Activity 1.4.3: The regional stakeholder group and the science advisory sub-team identify and evaluate activities that may affect populations and habitats.

Activity 1.4.4: The regional stakeholder group and the science advisory sub-team determine which key or critical species from step 1.3.6 are likely to benefit from MPAs in the region. Regulations allowing take for species not likely to benefit should also be considered as prohibition of their take could lead to unnecessary socioeconomic impact. All species, however, should be considered for their ecological roles and interactions, whether the individual species benefit or not.

Activity 1.4.5: The regional stakeholder group and the science advisory sub-team identify key locations in the region where MPAs may help achieve the MLPA goals and contribute to an overall network. The groups will consider both ecologically important areas and areas of key human interest in their discussions.

Task 2: Assemble Draft Regional Alternative MPA Proposals

The objective of this task is to make specific recommendations on changes to existing MPAs along with suggestions for alternative new MPAs and other potential management measures. The intent is for the sum of individual MPAs to meet the regional goals and objectives and the sum of the regions to meet the MLPA goals and objectives and network requirements, while noting that any individual MPA may not meet all of the goals of the region or network.

Activity 2.1: Recommend potential changes to existing MPAs.

Activity 2.1.1: The regional stakeholder group and the science sub-team review all the above information and make initial recommendations for the modification, reduction in size, expansion, or removal of existing MPAs in order to meet regional goals and objectives consistent with the goals of the MLPA and of other relevant State law.

Activity 2.2: Assemble draft alternative MPA proposals for the region

Activity 2.2.1: The regional stakeholder group and the science advisory sub-team prepare a range of alternative proposals including a variety of MPAs within the region.

Deleted: Develop regional ecological and socioeconomic goals, objectives and design considerations¶

¶ Activity 1.4.1: Drawing upon the regional profile and the goals and objectives of the MLPA, the regional stakeholder group and the science advisory sub-team design recommended regional goals, objectives and design considerations, consistent with the MLPA and other relevant state law. (See discussion of setting goals and objectives below.)¶

¶ Activity 1.4.2: The regional goals, objectives, and design considerations developed in the regional effort are reviewed by the science team, whose comments are forwarded to the task force. The task force reviews the proposed regional goals, objectives, and alternative network concepts and provides comments and suggestions to the regional stakeholder group for consideration in revision. The task force subsequently forwards its comments and suggestions, together with the proposed regional goals, objectives, and network concepts, to the Department ¶

... [4]

Deleted: ¶ Activity 1.5.1: The regional stakeholder group and the science advisory sub-team identify key locations in the region where MPAs may help achieve the MLPA goals and contribute to an overall network. The groups will consider both ecologically important areas and areas of key human interest in their discussions. ... [5]

Deleted: 5.2

Deleted: identify and

Deleted: wildlife populations, habitats, and various human uses that may negatively impact

Deleted: populations and

Deleted: 5.3

Deleted: activities that may affect

Deleted: and

Deleted: 5.

Deleted: determine which key or critical species from step 1.3.6 are likely to benefit from MPAs in the region. Regulations allowing take for species not likely to benefit should also be considered as prohibition of their take could lead to unnecessary socioeconomic impact. All species, however, should be considered for their ecological roles and interactions, whether the individual species benefit or not. ... [6]

Deleted: lead to unnecessary socioeconomic impact. All species should be considered for their ecological roles and interactions, whether the individual species benefit or not. ... [7]

Deleted: Activity 1.5.5: The regional stakeholder group and the science advisory sub-team identify key locations in the region where MPAs may help achieve the MLPA goals and contribute to an overall network. The groups will consider both ecologically important areas and areas of key human interest in their discussions. ... [8]

Deleted: Packages

Deleted: packages

Deleted: ¶ Activity 2.2.1: The regional stakeholder group reviews each draft alternative MPA proposal for the region. ... [9]

Deleted: 2

Deleted: July 21, 2006

Each proposal is intended to achieve the goals and objectives of the MLPA and is based on the design considerations developed for the region

Activity 2.2.2: The regional stakeholder group reviews each revised or potential new MPA and identifies initial objectives for each MPA to help meet the goals and objectives of the MLPA.

Deleted: Activity 2.2.3: The alternative proposals are presented to the task force or Commission and SAT for review and evaluation.¶

Activity 2.2.3: The alternative proposals are presented to the task force and SAT for review and evaluation.

Task 3: Evaluate Alternative MPA proposals

The objectives of this task are to conduct initial reviews of the alternative MPA proposals, to conduct environmental and socioeconomic analyses as required by law, and to identify potential monitoring and evaluation indicators for long-term management.

Activity 3.1: Evaluate alternative MPA proposals.

The science advisory sub-team and science team conduct a variety of analyses in order to provide relative comparisons of each package to each other in respect to the MLPA goals and objectives and other relevant State law. This review is provided to the BRTF and Commission for discussion and may lead to revisions to the proposals and a repetition of portions of Task 3.

Activity 3.1.1: The science advisory sub-team and science team prepare preliminary analyses of the habitats within MPAs, MPA sizes, and MPA spacing for each alternative proposal. These analyses provide a relative comparison of how well each proposal meets specific goals of the MLPA.

Activity 3.1.2: The science advisory sub-team and science team, in conjunction with the Department and potential contracted support, prepare a preliminary analysis of the maximum potential impact of each proposal to existing fishing in terms of area set aside versus frequency of use.

Activity 3.1.3: The regional stakeholder group reviews the science team analyses and revises proposals, as necessary, to more fully meet the goals, objectives and design considerations.

Activity 3.2: Identify monitoring and evaluation indicators.

The regional stakeholder group and the science advisory sub-team identify potential monitoring and evaluation indicators used to evaluate progress toward achieving goals and objectives.

Activity 3.3: Forward proposals to Commission.

The task force forwards alternative proposals for MPAs, initial evaluations, and the general management plan, together with its own evaluation and a preferred alternative, to the Commission for its consideration and actions.

Activity 3.3.1: The Department conducts a feasibility analysis of the proposals. This includes analysis of Department ability to enforce, monitor, manage and fund the full

Deleted: Department.

Deleted: Department

Deleted: submission to the Commission.

Deleted: ¶
Activity 3.3.1: The Department conducts a feasibility analysis of the proposals. This analysis includes analysis of the Department's ability to enforce, monitor, manage and fund the full implementation of the proposed MPAs. The analysis will not be contingent upon existing funds, but proposals must be reasonably expected to be implemented within the MLPA implementation timeframe. Proposals that are found infeasible may be altered by the Department in preparation of its preferred alternative, returned to the regional stakeholder group for further discussion and revision, or noted with specific comments for the Commission. ¶

Deleted: Activity 3.3.2: The Department with assistance from the science team designs a general management plan for MPAs in the region, including specific plans for monitoring, enforcement, costs and financing, and periodic review of effectiveness. This plan may be forwarded to the Commission along with the specific area proposals or separately during the decision making process (Task 5).¶

Deleted: July 21, 2006

implementation of the proposed MPAs. The analysis will not be contingent upon existing funds, but proposals must be reasonably expected to be implemented within the MLPA implementation timeframe. Proposals that are found infeasible will be noted with specific comments for the Commission.

Activity 3.3.2: The Department provides its comments based upon the feasibility analysis to the Commission including any recommendations on how to make proposals feasible while maintaining their scientific integrity and ability to fulfill the goals and objectives of the MLPA.

Deleted: Activity 3.3.3: The Department prepares a preferred alternative based upon the information submitted by the task force, regional stakeholder group, and other stakeholders or interested parties.¶

Activity 3.3.3: The Department with assistance from the science team designs a general management plan for MPAs in the region, including specific plans for monitoring, enforcement, costs and financing, and periodic review of effectiveness. This plan may be forwarded to the Commission along with the specific area proposals or separately during the decision making process (Task 5).

Deleted: Activity 3.4: Submit proposals to Commission.¶ The Department submits those alternative proposals that are consistent with the MLPA, a preferred alternative, and other pertinent information from the regional groups and the task force, to the Commission.¶

Task 4: Commission consideration and action

The objectives of this task are to consider public testimony and other information regarding the MPA proposals submitted by the Department and to take action on these proposals.

Activity 4.1: Commission review of proposals.

The Commission reviews the alternative regional MPA proposals, takes public testimony, and determines whether to request that the Department begin the formal regulatory process.

Activity 4.2: Formal regulatory process.

If the Commission does make such a request, the Department prepares regulatory language and other documents and analyses required by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and other relevant law.

Activity 4.3: Public testimony.

The Commission then accepts public testimony on the alternative regional MPA proposals and on the analyses conducted under CEQA and other law.

Activity 4.4: The Commission acts on alternative regional MPA proposals.

Deleted: July 21, 2006

Section 5. Enforcement

Existing Enforcement Assets

As indicated in the MLPA [FGC Section 2851(a)], a lack of enforcement resources is one of the reasons California's existing MPAs create the illusion of protection while falling short of their potential to protect resources. This lack of resources is not unique to MPA enforcement and is true across all fisheries enforcement in California. To remedy this, the MLPA requires that the Marine Life Protection Program provide for adequate enforcement [FGC Section 2853(b)(5)] and include appropriate enforcement measures for all MPAs in the system [FGC Section 2853(c)(2)]. The MLPA includes in this the use, to the extent practicable, of advanced technology and surveillance systems. Because of the added emphasis on MPAs established by the MLPA and the clear need for increased enforcement resources, additional assets will be required.

The Department of Fish and Game's enforcement staff is charged with enforcing marine resource management laws and regulations over an area encompassing approximately 1,100 miles of coastline and out to sea. Department staff also provide enforcement of federal laws and regulations within State waters and in federal waters. Enforcement duties include all commercial and sport fishing statutes and regulations, all Fish and Game Code and Title 14, California Code of Regulations restrictions, marine water pollution incidents, homeland security, and general public safety. General fishing regulations and other restrictions apply within MPAs as well as specific MPA restrictions.

The Department shares jurisdiction for federal regulations including the Magnuson Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act, the Endangered Species Act, and the Lacey Act. Department enforcement patrols regularly extend into federal waters or the Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ), generally defined as 3 to 200 nautical miles from shore. A significant portion of both commercial and recreational fishing effort, and subsequently enforcement effort, occurs in federal waters and the EEZ. The existing patrol effort beyond state waters and outside MPAs must also be considered in the plan. How effectively state and federal regulations are enforced within and around the MPAs will affect the success of MPAs in conserving and protecting marine resources.

Deleted: between three and 12 nautical miles from shore as well as into

Deleted: beyond 12

The Department of Fish and Game maintains a fleet of seven large patrol boats in the 54- to 65-foot class stationed at major ports throughout the state. These patrol boats are staffed by a cadre of 22 officers, and five support personnel. The Department also has eight patrol boats in the 24- to 30-foot range, and another 15 patrol skiffs stationed at ports and harbors throughout the state. Overall the Department has approximately 230 wardens in the field, responsible for a combination of both inland and marine patrol. A portion of these wardens have a "marine emphasis" focusing primarily on ocean enforcement but also enforcing inland regulations. The Department has a fleet of single- and twin-engine fixed wing aircraft that work in conjunction with both marine and land based wardens to help identify and investigate violations. Though seemingly impressive, when compared to the more than 5,000 square miles of California State waters and the federal waters beyond, as well as California's vast inland area, these numbers are quite small.

Deleted: July 21, 2006

Section 6: Monitoring and Adaptive Management of MPAs

The MLPA requires adaptive management to ensure that a system of MPAs meets its stated goals [Section 2853 (c) (3)]. The MLPA defines adaptive management as “a management policy that seeks to improve management of biological resources, particularly in areas of scientific uncertainty, by viewing program actions as tools for learning. Actions shall be designed so that, even if they fail, they will provide useful information for future actions, and monitoring and evaluation shall be emphasized so that the interaction of different elements within marine systems may be better understood” (Section 2852 (a)). Adaptive management requires learning from current experience to improve the process of achieving the goals of the MLPA over time. The law embeds ecosystem-based adaptive management, monitoring, and evaluation into the state policies related to the management of MPAs.

This approach will require the State to develop and implement a monitoring, evaluation, and adaptive management program. The State must also develop the institutions and processes for adaptive management which do not yet exist. Two such examples are the institutions and processes by which monitoring data are collected, maintained and made useful to policy makers over long periods of time and those required to assess this information, including involvement of scientists and stakeholders and formulate recommendations to policy makers. Adaptive management, monitoring, and evaluation will be implemented at multiple spatial scales, including individual MPA, MPA networks in a region, and statewide when appropriate.

It is worth noting that the MLPA calls for monitoring and evaluation of selected areas within the preferred alternative to assist with adaptive management of the MPA network. This does not mean that other MPAs should not also be monitored and evaluated in accordance with their own objectives and regional goals, but that the performance of selected MPAs might be used to guide future decisions over a wider area.

Monitoring and evaluation should not be done for their own sake, but to gauge the performance of an MPA in relation to its objectives. A cost effective approach in many areas may be to link these activities to other ongoing monitoring activities. Similarly there may be many opportunities to involve affected stakeholders and members of the general public in monitoring and evaluation activities as well, thus leveraging further the resources available.

An important part of marine ecosystem management is the establishment of programs to monitor, evaluate performance, and adaptively manage the biological, social, and economic status and trends of areas within and nearby the MPAs. This chapter develops a general approach to these issues and Chapter 8 includes specifics for individual MPA network components. Long-term monitoring data are critical for understanding the status and trends of resources and identifying emerging threats to MPAs. The data will help managers, policymakers, scientists, and stakeholders determine the impacts and effectiveness of the MPA array. Data will be used to evaluate the progress towards achieving the statewide goals, regional goals and objectives, and objectives for individual MPAs established by the MLPA and by the regional stakeholder groups. They will aid in understanding the structure and function of ecosystems within the MPA system, and thereby provide an improved scientific basis for future decision-making. These data will be used for adaptive management of the MPAs.

Deleted: In the last several decades, monitoring and evaluation have become important features of management approaches to living marine resources and the environment (NRC 1990, NRC 2001). More recently, they have become central elements in management programs intended to adapt as understanding of the managed ecosystems – both the biophysical and social systems – improves and circumstances change. In California, the legislature incorporated this adaptive approach into the Marine Life Management Act (MLMA) in 1998. Besides defining adaptive management, the MLMA requires the development of research and monitoring activities within fishery management plans [FGC Sections 90.1, 7073(b)(3), and 7081]. ¶

Deleted: A year later, the legislature incorporated the principle of adaptive management as well as monitoring and evaluation of MPAs and a statewide MPA network into the MLPA in several passages. At FGC Section 2856(a)(2)(H), for instance, the MLPA requires that the master plan include “[R]ecommendations for monitoring, research, and evaluation in selected areas of the preferred alternative, including existing and long-established MPAs, to assist in adaptive management of the MPA network, taking into account existing and planned research and evaluation efforts.” ¶

¶ In these and other ways, the MLPA emphasizes the role of monitoring and evaluation in adapting individual MPAs and the MPA network in response to new knowledge and circumstances. The adaptive management approach of the MLPA provides for future proposals to add, modify, or eliminate MPAs based on information gained from monitoring and evaluation activities, the development of new scientific information, and input from interested parties. ¶

Deleted: Since MPAs will be implemented in a phased approach in individual regions through 2011 rather than adopted all at once statewide, the initial focus must be on developing effective monitoring programs in individual regions, including monitoring in areas both inside and outside MPAs. The final phase in developing monitoring and evaluation programs will be to evaluate and adjust these programs in individual regions to reflect a coherent program statewide. ¶

Deleted: July 21, 2006

Since MPAs will be implemented in a phased approach in individual regions through 2011, rather than adopted all at once statewide, the monitoring programs will be developed sequentially as planning is completed for each region. Nevertheless, integrating these regional monitoring programs into a coherent statewide program will be essential to ensure the resulting data can be analyzed, reported, and used to inform statewide policies. Significant economies of scale also will result if standardized methods are applied across multiple locations and regions. Early consideration should be given to how the regional monitoring programs will be integrated into the statewide system, because such integration is likely to require development of general practices – such as protocols, data standards, and information management systems – that can be applied across multiple MPAs and regions.

Clear and measurable objectives should form the basis for the design of systems to monitor and evaluate the impacts of management actions. Monitoring and evaluation systems should explicitly address five principles (Pomeroy et al. 2004). Such programs should be:

Deleted: , in turn,

- Useful to managers and stakeholders for improving MPA management;
- Practical in use and cost;
- Balanced to seek and include scientific input and public participation;
- Flexible for use at different sites and in varying conditions; and
- Holistic through a focus on both natural and human perspectives.

Developing a Monitoring and Evaluation Program for MPAs and Network Components

To promote consistency among monitoring and evaluation programs in different regions, a consistent process should be followed. Many of the recommendations below are modified from a 2004 guidebook to natural and social indicators for evaluating MPA management effectiveness (Pomeroy et al. 2004). This discussion relies heavily on the guidebook because it is comprehensive, reflects the experience from MPAs around the world, has been field tested, and relies principally upon techniques that are simple rather than complex, and therefore more likely to be implemented and sustained over the long-term. The overall intent is to ensure that progress is made to achieve the overall Goals of the MLPA. Individual MPA objectives are important in this, but should be linked to the program goals for use in evaluation.

Deleted: come

The process below presents only the more general features of the approach presented by Pomeroy et al.; much more detail is available in the guidebook itself. In addition, monitoring and evaluation programs should reflect local conditions, constraints and opportunities. The basic steps for establishing a monitoring program are listed below and displayed in a flowchart in Figure 5.

- Identify regional goals and objectives and individual MPA objectives
 - Identify any overlapping goals and objectives
- Select indicators to evaluate biophysical and socioeconomic patterns and processes
 - Review and prioritize indicators,
 - Develop quantifiable benchmarks of progress on indicators that will measure progress toward regional goals and objectives and individual MPA objectives, and
 - Identify how selected indicators and benchmarks relate to one another

Deleted: ,

Deleted: and governance

Deleted: July 21, 2006

- Plan the evaluation
 - Assess existing data;
 - Assess resource needs for measuring selected indicators;
 - Determine the audiences to receive the evaluation results;
 - Review relevant monitoring and evaluation programs at existing MPAs, such as at the Channel Islands;
 - Identify participants in the evaluation; and
 - Develop a timeline and work plan for the evaluation.
- Review and revise planned monitoring and evaluation program
 - Conduct structured peer and public review processes, and
 - Make modifications in response to review
- Implement the evaluation work plan
 - Select methods and approach and collect data;
 - Manage collected data (including identifying the data manager, providing for the long-term archiving and access to the data, and making the data available for analysis and sharing);
 - Analyze collected data; and
 - Conduct peer review and independent evaluation to ensure robustness and credibility of results
- Communicate results and adapt management
 - Share results with target audiences, and
 - Use results to adapt management strategies

Indicators of success include those pertaining to biophysical and socioeconomic goals and objectives. Examples include, among many others, focal species abundance to determine whether resources are being sustained, and human use levels to determine if desired enhancement of recreational, research, and other non-consumptive opportunities is occurring.

Pomeroy et al. list a total of 42 indicators (10 biophysical, 16 socioeconomic, and 16 governance) that cover combinations of 21 commonly used MPA goals and 68 commonly used objectives. The guidebook essentially provides a “toolbox” of indicators and a starting point for developing a plan. It also provides some detail on survey methods used to measure the indicators, though is not a comprehensive listing of all survey methodologies. Once regional goals and objectives are selected and individual MPA objectives determined, the guidebook and following flowchart (Figure 5) will help provide a method to establish monitoring programs.

Deleted: goals

Deleted: objectives,


Deleted: , and governance (management) goals and objectives

Deleted: , household income to determine whether livelihoods affected by MPAs are being enhanced or maintained, and level of enforcement coverage

Deleted: effective management strategies are in place

Deleted: July 21, 2006

Figure 5. Flowchart of process to establish and conduct a monitoring program¹².



¹² Adapted from Pomeroy, et al., 2004.

To achieve the purpose of informing adaptive management, the results of monitoring and evaluation must be communicated to decision makers and the public in terms that they can understand and act upon (NRC 1990). Moreover, in addition to aiding in MPA management, measuring, analyzing and communicating indicators can promote learning, sharing of knowledge and better understanding of MPA natural and social systems among scientists, resource managers, stakeholders, members of the public, and other interested parties (Pomeroy et al. 2004). To these ends, monitoring and evaluation programs for MPAs should include a communications plan that identifies the target audiences and specifies the timing, methods, and resources to regularly synthesize and present monitoring and evaluation results.

Though the results from ongoing monitoring and evaluation should be reviewed periodically, a comprehensive analysis of monitoring results should be conducted approximately every five years. The longer time-frame for review takes into account the fact that biological changes are slow to occur. Some trends are more likely to become apparent on this time scale, although others may take longer to emerge. These reviews should be transparent, include peer review, and make results available to the public. Besides evaluating monitoring methods and results, the review should evaluate whether or not the monitoring results are consistent with the objectives of the individual MPA, the goals and objectives of the region, and those of the MLPA. If the results are not consistent, the review should develop recommendations for adjustments in the management of the MPA network.

Deleted: three to

Deleted: and

Within the above set of required components, specific monitoring methods are not prescribed, although, as mentioned previously, some alignment of regional and statewide approaches will be desired. For example, monitoring and evaluation programs may be effective within a range of levels in intensity and sampling frequencies. They also may rely on different indicators, depending on the individual and regional MPA goals and objectives.

General Considerations in Identifying Indicators

An indicator measures the success of a management action, such as the specific design of an MPA. It is a unit of information measured over time that will make it possible to document changes in specific attributes of the MPA (Pomeroy et al. 2004). General considerations in selecting or designing an indicator include:

- Measurable - able to be recorded and analyzed in quantitative or qualitative terms.
- Precise - clear meaning, with any differences in meaning well understood OR measured the same way by different people.
- Consistent - not changing over time, but always measuring the same thing.
- Sensitive - changing proportionately in response to actual changes in the variables measured.
- Simple - rather than complex.
- Independence defined - correlation with other indicators examined.

In selecting indicators, a monitoring and evaluation plan for a portion of the MPA network should (Pomeroy et al. 2004):

Deleted: n MPA or

- Define and provide a brief description of the indicator;

Deleted: July 21, 2006 Page

- Explain the purpose and rationale for measuring the indicator;
- Consider difficulty and utility—that is, how difficult it is to measure and the relative usefulness of information provided by the indicator;
- Evaluate the required resources including people, equipment, and funding;
- Specify the method and approach to collecting, analyzing, and how the sampling design addresses issues of spatial and temporal variation;
- Identify reference points or benchmarks against which results will be measured and timelines within which changes are expected;
- Explain how results from measuring the indicator can be used to better understand and adaptively manage the program;
- Provide references on methods and previous uses of the indicator.

Deleted: presenting information on

Deleted: indicator, including sample size, and

Deleted: MPA

Prior knowledge of the variability in the indicators selected should be incorporated into the monitoring and evaluation design where possible. If no prior knowledge exists variation in indicators must be identified within the monitoring and evaluation program. Multiple independent indicators are required for complex systems such as in the marine environment. Consideration also should be given to the timescale within which changes in an indicator might reasonably be expected. For instance, recovery of populations of long-lived species, such as some rockfishes, may require many years; performance measures or other types of benchmarks for such indicators should reflect this longer timescale.

Monitoring and evaluation programs should measure at a minimum biophysical and socioeconomic indicators, since these dimensions of marine ecosystems are inextricably linked (Pomeroy et al. 2004). Possible indicators are described below.

Deleted: MPA monitoring

Deleted: ,

Deleted: , and governance

Biophysical. One common focus of MPA programs is the conservation of living marine resources and habitats of California's coastal waters. Likely biophysical goals established under the MLPA include sustaining the abundance and diversity of marine wildlife, protecting vulnerable species and habitats, and restoring depleted populations and degraded habitats. Thus, potential biophysical indicators might include (Pomeroy et al. 2004):

Deleted: MPAs

Deleted: of individual MPAs and MPA networks

- Abundance and population structure of species of high ecological or human use value;
- Composition and structure of a community of organisms;
- Survival of young;
- Measures of ecosystem condition;
- Type and level of return on fishing effort;
- Water quality; and
- Areas whose habitat or wildlife populations are showing signs of recovery.

Socioeconomic. Socioeconomic indicators make it possible to understand and incorporate the concerns and interests of stakeholders, to determine the impacts of management measures on stakeholders, and to document the uses and values of the program for the public and to decision makers (Pomeroy et al. 2004).

Deleted: value

Deleted: an MPA to

Examples of possible socioeconomic indicators consistent with MLPA goals include:

Deleted: Possible

Deleted: (Pomeroy et al. 2004)

Deleted: July 21, 2006 Page

- Use data (and values of those uses) for consumptive and non-consumptive purposes, including:
 - Numbers of participants
 - Measures of economic and perceived value and level of satisfaction derived from allowed consumptive and non-consumptive activities
 - Changes in geographic and other patterns of use in and around MPAs within the region;
- Effects of allowed human uses on MPA resources;
- Volunteer and community engagement in MPA-related monitoring and education;
- Shareholder knowledge of natural history and current use patterns and intensity.

Deleted: Economic effects on local communities

Deleted: to supporting industry¶
Measures of

Deleted: <#>Level of understanding of human impacts on resources;¶
<#>Perceptions of non-market and non-use value;¶
<#>Community infrastructure and business;¶
<#>Number and nature of markets; and¶

All of these indicators would be tailored and specifically defined to reflect the conditions, resources present, use patterns and goals and objectives of each MPA or region.

In addition, it is important to recognize the role that volunteer monitoring activities can play in evaluation. As mentioned earlier, there may be many opportunities to leverage with existing monitoring activities in the region and to make very productive use of stakeholder, other members of the public and educational and research entities to form partnerships in conducting monitoring and management programs. For example, the Citizen Watershed Monitoring Network in the Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary has used a monitoring protocol developed by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency in collecting information on water quality in the sanctuary. Information from this program has helped in determining where education and outreach efforts should be targeted, in determining how successful specific pollution reduction activities have been, and in identifying problem areas for further investigation.

Deleted: Governance. By definition, MPAs are a governance tool since they limit, forbid, or otherwise control human use of marine areas and wildlife through rights and rules (Pomeroy and others 2004). Governance may include enforcement, use rights, and regulations. Goals for governance of MPAs include the following (Pomeroy et al. 2004): ¶

¶
<#>Legal certainty as indicated by legal challenges or reported failure to act because of legal uncertainty;¶
<#>Effective management structures and strategies maintained;¶
<#>Effective legal structures and strategies for management maintained;¶
<#>Effective public participation and representation ensured;¶
<#>Management plan compliance by resource users enhanced; and¶
<#>Resource use conflicts managed and reduced.¶

¶
Possible governance indicators include the following:¶

¶
<#>Local understanding of MPA regulations;¶
<#>Availability of MPA administrative resources;¶
<#>Existence and activity level of community organizations; ¶
<#>Level of public involvement; and¶
<#>Clearly defined enforcement procedures.¶
¶

Finally, monitoring and evaluation programs can benefit from engaging commercial and recreational fishermen. At the Channel Islands, in Morro Bay, Fort Bragg, and elsewhere along the California coast, fishermen, research scientists, and federal and state biologists are carrying out field projects of mutual interest, including tag-and-recapture studies that provide critical information on the movement of fish and their growth rates. Similarly, recreational fishermen have recently participated in collecting information on their catches as part of the Coastside Fishing Club's Recreational Catch Estimation Project. The Channel Islands National Marine Sanctuary Foundation supports a Cooperative Marine Research Program which helps coordinate and fund fisheries/science cooperative monitoring projects. These initiatives are in the early stages of development, and offer important opportunities for collaboration.

Deleted: July 21, 2006 Page

In 2005, the Governor's budget proposed \$500,000 from the Environmental License Plate Fund to continue MLPA implementation. The agendas for both the Assembly Budget Subcommittee No. 3 (April 13, 2005) and the Senate Budget and Fiscal Review Subcommittee No. 2 (May 18, 2005) note the funding "is leveraging over \$2 million in private foundation expenditures." In February, the Legislative Analyst's Office recommended that the Legislature hold the issue open pending receipt and review of the draft Master Plan Framework from the Blue Ribbon Task Force.¹⁸ After the draft Framework was transmitted to the Fish and Game Commission on May 13, 2005, the Senate Subcommittee staff recommended approving the proposal as budgeted. Consistent with the subcommittee actions, the Budget Bill (SB 77, Stats.2005, Chapter 38) appropriated \$15,802,000 (Item 3600-001-0005), of which \$500,000 was allocated through a Budget Change Proposal to the Marine Region for MLPA Design Management (PCA A1020) totaling \$416,667.

The Governor's January 10, 2006 budget again proposed \$500,000 from the Environmental License Plate Fund to continue MLPA implementation.¹⁹ A March 30, 2006 Finance Letter included an additional \$380,000 from the General Fund to fund existing Department positions that were supported by a reimbursement contract with the Resources Legacy Fund Foundation, which expires December 31, 2006.²⁰ On April 24, 2006, Senate Subcommittee No. 2 staff recommended that it hold the issue open and request the Department to provide additional information. The Governor's May 2006 Revision proposed \$2.6 million from the General Fund to the Ocean Protection Council for MLPA implementation, together with an equivalent amount of reimbursement authority to the Department. On May 17, 2006, staff for the Senate Budget and Fiscal Review Subcommittee No. 2 recommended that it approve all MLPA proposals as budgeted. Consistent with the subcommittee actions, the Budget Bill (AB 1801, Stats.2006, Chapter 47) appropriated "at least" \$ 3.47 million for MLPA implementation (Item 3600-001-0001, paragraph 8). The final approved budget for the 2006/2007 fiscal year included 11 new fulltime permanent positions for the Department to assist with planning and implementation of the MLPA along with additional one-time funds provided to both the Department and Ocean Protection Council to assist with MLPA planning and implementation. These positions and additional funding allowed the Department to establish a new organizational unit dealing specifically with MPA processes.

Blue Ribbon Task Force Input on Future Funding

Decisions about funding the MLPA involve considerations of:

1. Appropriate sources of funds;
2. Expected activities required to implement the MLPA;
3. Possible partners in funding or performing activities required to implement the MLPA;
4. Expected duration and levels of expenditures; and
5. Structures for receipt and allocation of funds.

Each of these decisions was considered by the MLPA Blue Ribbon Task Force (BRTF) and recommendations made for each.

¹⁸Analysis of the 2005-06 Budget Bill (LAO: February 2005), pp. B-63 to B-65.

¹⁹"Environmental License Plate Fund (ELPF)," Presentation to Assembly Budget Subcommittee No. 3 (LAO: May 23, 2006), p. 2.

²⁰Senate Budget and Fiscal Review Subcommittee No. 2 Agenda (April 24, 2006), p. 15.

Deleted: July 21, 2006 Page

Section 8. Regional MPA Management Plans

8.1: North Coast Region (California/Oregon border to Alder Creek near Point Arena)

Timeline to be Determined

8.2: North-Central Coast Region (Alder Creek near Point Arena to Pigeon Point)

Note that this regional process partially overlaps with the San Francisco Bay region

Proposed Timeline

Convene Stakeholder Working Group - April 2007

Complete Working Group Process - March 2008

Blue Ribbon Task Force Provides Recommendations to Commission, - April 2008

Commission Consideration of Recommended Alternatives - May - December 2008

Completion of Regulatory and Environmental Review Processes - January 2009

8.3: San Francisco Bay Region (Waters within the San Francisco Bay District as defined in CCR, Title 14, Section 27.00)

Note that this regional process partially overlaps with the North-Central Coast region

Timeline to be Determined

8.4: Central Coast Region (Pigeon Point to Point Conception)

8.4.1 Introduction

Description of region

The Central Coast study region is one of the most biologically productive regions in the world. Furthermore, California's marine and coastal environments form part of the State's identity and support important economies that depend on healthy ocean resources, such as fisheries and coastal tourism. A detailed description of the Central Coast region is found in the California Marine Life Protection Act Initiative Regional Profile of the Central Coast Study Region (Pigeon Point to Point Conception, CA) (MLPA Initiative, 2005). The following management plan for Central Coast MPAs is intended to summarize this description and key features and considerations for design and implementation of MPAs.

The Central Coast study region encompasses approximately 860 square nautical miles and extends from the shoreline (mean high tide) to a maximum depth of approximately 1,475 meters (806 fm) in Monterey Submarine Canyon. Within Monterey Bay the state waters boundary extends more than the usual 3 nautical miles from shore to a distance of more than 15 miles from shore. The study region includes a broad array of habitats from intertidal to continental shelf and slope and submarine canyons that bisect the continental margin.

Deleted: Proposed

Deleted: ¶
Convene Stakeholder Working Group - August 2010¶
Complete Working Group Process - July 2011¶
Prepare Final Proposals

Deleted: Commission - August 2011 to October 2011

Deleted: Planned Completion (begin Commission consideration process) - November 2011¶

Deleted: July 2008

Deleted: June 2009

Deleted: Prepare Final Proposals

Deleted: - July 2009 to October 2009

Deleted: Planned Completion (begin

Deleted: consideration process) - November 2009

Deleted: Proposed

Deleted: ¶
Convene Stakeholder Working Group - February 2009¶
Complete Working Group Process - January 2010¶
Prepare Final Proposals

Deleted: Commission - February 2010 to April 2010

Deleted: Planned Completion (begin Commission consideration process) - May 2010¶

Deleted: July 21, 2006 Page

statements of what the regional MPAs are ultimately trying to achieve (Pomeroy et al., 2004). The Regional goals are largely taken directly from the MLPA itself. Regional objectives are more specific measurable statements of what must be accomplished to attain a related goal (Pomeroy et al., 2004).

Goal 1. To protect the natural diversity and abundance of marine life, and the structure, function, and integrity of marine ecosystems.

1. Protect areas of high species diversity and maintain species diversity and abundance, consistent with natural fluctuations, of populations in representative habitats.
2. Protect marine life communities associated with areas of diverse habitat types in close proximity to each other.
3. Protect natural size and age structure and genetic diversity of populations in representative habitats.
4. Protect natural trophic structure and food webs in representative habitats.
5. Protect ecosystem structure, function, integrity and ecological processes to facilitate recovery of natural communities from disturbances both natural and human induced.

Deleted: with

Goal 2. To help sustain, conserve, and protect marine life populations, including those of economic value, and rebuild those that are depleted.

1. Help protect or rebuild populations of rare, threatened, endangered, depleted, or overfished species, where identified, and the habitats and ecosystem functions upon which they rely.
2. Protect larval sources and enhance reproductive capacity of species most likely to benefit from MPAs through retention of large, mature individuals.
3. Protect selected species and the habitats on which they depend while allowing the harvest of migratory, highly mobile, or other species where appropriate through the use of state marine conservation areas and state marine parks.

Goal 3. To improve recreational, educational, and study opportunities provided by marine ecosystems that are subject to minimal human disturbances, and to manage these uses in a manner consistent with protecting biodiversity.

1. Ensure some MPAs are close to population centers and research and education institutions and include areas of traditional non-consumptive recreational use and are accessible for recreational, educational, and study opportunities.
2. To enhance the likelihood of scientifically valid studies, replicate appropriate MPA designations, habitats or control areas (including areas open to fishing) to the extent possible.
3. Develop collaborative scientific monitoring and research projects evaluating MPAs that link with classroom science curricula, volunteer dive programs, and fishermen of all ages, and identify participants.
4. Protect or enhance recreational experience by ensuring natural size and age structure of marine populations.

Goal 4. To protect marine natural heritage, including protection of representative and unique marine life habitats in central California waters, for their intrinsic value.

1. Include within MPAs the following habitat types: estuaries, heads of submarine canyons, and pinnacles.

Deleted: July 21, 2006 Page

2. Protect species associated with, and replicate to the extent possible, representatives of all marine habitats identified in the MLPA or the Master Plan Framework across a range of depths.

Goal 5. To ensure that central California's MPAs have clearly defined objectives, effective management measures, and adequate enforcement, and are based on sound scientific guidelines.

1. Minimize negative socio-economic impacts and optimize positive socio-economic impacts for all users, to the extent possible, and if consistent with the Marine Life Protection Act and its goals and guidelines.
2. For all MPAs in the region, develop objectives, a long-term monitoring plan that includes standardized biological and socioeconomic monitoring protocols, and a strategy for MPA evaluation, and ensure that each MPA objective is linked to one or more regional objectives.
3. To the extent possible, effectively use scientific guidelines in the Master Plan Framework.

Goal 6. To ensure that the central coast's MPAs are designed and managed, to the extent possible, as a component of a statewide network.

1. Develop a process for regional review and evaluation of implementation effectiveness that includes stakeholder involvement to determine if regional MPAs are an effective component of a statewide network.
2. Develop a mechanism to coordinate with future MLPA regional stakeholder groups in other regions to ensure that the statewide MPA network meets the goals of the MLPA.

Description of individual MPA and MMA boundaries, regulations, and objectives

Explanation of Descriptive Parameters:

Proposed MPA or MMA: The proposed name and classification of the marine protected area or marine managed area, using the classification system established by the Marine Managed Areas Improvement Act.

Area (square miles): The approximate surface area of the proposed MPA or MMA measured using a geographical information system program.

Along-shore span (miles): The approximate straight line distance parallel to shore of the proposed MPA or MMA or, if not adjacent to shore, the straight line distance of the greatest dimension parallel or perpendicular to shore. This distance is not the length of the shoreline within the MPA, but rather an "as-the-fish-swims" measure.

Depth range (feet): The approximate range of depth within the proposed MPA or MMA, with 0 feet being equivalent to the shoreward boundary of mean high tide if applicable measured using a geographical information system program.

Primary habitat types: The types of benthic substrate and/or attached marine plant or macroalgal species which comprise the majority of the proposed MPA or MMA.

Proposed regulations: The specific fishing or other use regulations within the proposed MPA or MMA which are in addition to those of the general area.

Boundaries: Waypoints expressed in latitude and longitude defining the corners of the proposed MPA or MMA (including the intersection with the shoreline at mean high tide if applicable), with straight lines, unless otherwise specified, connecting the waypoints in the order listed to form the seaward boundaries.

Deleted: July 21, 2006 Page

Examples of species likely to benefit: A subset of the marine fish, invertebrate, plant, bird, and mammal species likely to directly or indirectly benefit from the proposed MPA or MMA. This includes marine fish, invertebrate, and plant species which are generally either sessile, sedentary, or have relatively small home ranges and for which take is prohibited in the proposed regulations, but also includes marine bird and mammal species which, although already fully protected through other regulations or statutes, may benefit further from protection of their primary prey or forage species.

Summary of Objectives: A brief summary of the objectives for the proposed MPA or MMA and how these objectives are related to the overall goals of the MLPA.

Detailed Objectives (with reference to regional goal and objective): a list of all the individual objectives proposed for the MPA or MMA, with reference to the applicable Regional Goal number and Regional Objective number.

Proposed MPA: Año Nuevo State Marine Reserve

Area (sq. mi.): 11.07

Deleted: 8.77

Along-shore span (mi): 8.4

Depth range (ft): 0-175

Deleted: 160

Primary habitat types: sandy beach, rocky intertidal, surfgrass, shallow hard and soft bottom.

Proposed regulations: No take. Note: an alternative is provided that would allow the take of kelp, with limitations, in this MPA. Final Commission decision will determine the regulations.

Boundaries: This area is bounded in the north by the mean high tide line and a distance of 200 feet seaward of mean low tide between the following two points (Figure 6):

37° 10.00' N. lat. 122° 21.90' W. long.; and

37° 08.70' N. lat. 122° 21.00' W. long.

Deleted: 07.25'

The area then continues southward bounded by the mean high tide line and straight lines connecting the following points in the order listed (Figure 6):

Deleted: 20.50

37° 08.70' N. lat. 122° 21.00' W. long.;

Deleted: 07.25'

37° 04.70' N. lat. 122° 21.00' W. long.; and

Deleted: 20.50'

37° 04.70' N. lat. 122° 16.20' W. long.

Deleted: 20.50'

Examples of species likely to benefit: nearshore and shelf rockfishes, lingcod, cabezon, kelp greenling, surfperches, sardine, mackerel, anchovy, California halibut, sanddabs, Dungeness crab, littleneck clams, squid, murre, shearwaters.

Summary of Objectives: Provide complete protection to shallow soft and hard substrates and associated species in an area characterized by low-relief shale and a mixture of giant kelp and bull kelp. This area is important to the formation of an ecologically sound MPA network component, by linking these habitats to similar habitats in other parts of the region.

Detailed Objectives (with reference to regional goal and objective):

Deleted: -----Page Break-----

- Protect area of high species diversity characteristic of the central coast region north of Monterey Bay and maintain species diversity and abundance as demonstrated by monitoring appropriate indicator species, with focus on Nearshore Fishery Management Plan species. (Goal 1, Objective 1)

Deleted: July 21, 2006 Page


- Protect communities associated with diverse intertidal habitats including wave-cut rocky platforms, sand and gravel beaches, offshore island, shallow rocky reef, shallow soft bottom, and mixed giant/bull kelp beds, in close proximity to each other. (Goal 1, Objective 2)
- Protect natural size and age structure and genetic diversity of populations of nearshore rockfish species and invertebrates including appropriate indicator species. (Goal 1, Objective 3)
- Protect natural trophic structure and food web including forage base (including crabs, squid and coastal pelagic finfish) for listed marine birds and marine mammals as well as higher trophic level fish. (Goal 1, Objective 4)
- Protect range of ecosystem functions associated with lee of headland in productive upwelling zone. (Goal 1, Objective 5)
- Protect important forage area for nearby breeding colonies of listed marine birds and marine mammals, including sea otters. Reduce disturbance to breeding colonies of listed marine birds, in particular marbled murrelets, and marine mammal rookeries from activities associated with vessels fishing (lights, noise, etc). (Goal 2, Objective 1)
- Protect larval source and enhance reproductive capacity of invertebrate species such as Dungeness crab, limpets, mussels, turban snails, red abalone, black abalone, and finfish species including nearshore rockfishes and California halibut. (Goal 2, Objective 2)
- Site a marine protected area adjacent to a terrestrial state park with high number of annual visitors that has traditionally served as an important marine education site through visitor center and docent program. (Goal 3, Objective 1)
- Include sandy and gravel beaches, and shallow hard and soft bottom habitat in a state marine reserve. (Goal 4, Objective 2)

Deleted: Protect

Deleted: ¶

Deleted: July 21, 2006 Page

Figure 6. Año Nuevo State Marine Reserve and Greyhound Rock State Marine Conservation Area



Deleted: ¶
¶
¶
<sp>¶

Proposed MPA: Greyhound Rock State Marine Conservation Area

Area (sq. mi.): 11.81

Along-shore span (mi): 3.1

Depth range (ft): 0-216

Deleted: ¶
¶
¶

Deleted: 23

Deleted: 209

Primary habitat types: sandy beach, rocky intertidal, surfgrass, shallow hard and soft bottom, kelp bed.

Proposed regulations: Take of all living marine resources is prohibited except commercial and recreational hand harvest of giant kelp (*Macrocystis* sp.); commercial and recreational take of squid (*Loligo opalescens*) and salmon (*Oncorhynchus* spp.); and the recreational harvest of finfish by hook-and-line from shore.

Boundaries: This area is bounded by the mean high tide line, the state water boundary and straight lines connecting the following points in the order listed except where stated as following the state water boundary (Figure 6):

37° 04.70' N. lat. 122° 16.20' W. long.;

37° 04.70' N. lat. 122° 21.00' W. long.;

37° 03.55' N. lat. 122° 21.00' W. long.; thence southward along the state water line to

37° 02.57' N. lat. 122° 19.10' W. long.; and

Deleted: 20.50'

Deleted: 20.50'

Deleted: July 21, 2006 Page

37° 02.57' N. lat. 122° 14.00' W. long.

Examples of species likely to benefit: nearshore and shelf rockfishes, lingcod, cabezon, kelp greenling, surfperches, sardine, mackerel, anchovy, California halibut, sanddabs, Dungeness crab, littleneck clams, squid, murre, shearwaters.

Summary of Objectives: Provide increased protection to shallow soft and hard substrates and associated species in the northern portion of the study region characterized by low-relief shale and a mixture of giant kelp and bull kelp. This area is intended to protect the subtidal fish and invertebrate and intertidal invertebrate communities while allowing for uses that have little on those communities to continue. This area is important to the formation of an ecologically sound MPA network component, by linking these habitats to similar habitats in other parts of the region.

Detailed Objectives (with reference to regional goal and objective):

- Protect area of high benthic species diversity characteristic of the central coast region north of Monterey Bay and maintain benthic species diversity and abundance as demonstrated by monitoring appropriate indicator species, with focus on Nearshore Fishery Management Plan species. (Goal 1, Objective 1)
- Protect natural size and age structure and genetic diversity of populations of nearshore rockfish species and invertebrates including appropriate indicator species. (Goal 1, Objective 3)
- Protect important forage area for nearby breeding colonies of listed marine birds by prohibiting the harvest of pelagic finfish other than salmon. (Goal 2, Objective 1)
- Protect larval source and enhance reproductive capacity of invertebrate species such as Dungeness crab, limpets, mussels, turban snails, red abalone, black abalone, and finfish species including nearshore rockfishes and California halibut. (Goal 2, Objective 2)

Proposed MPA: Natural Bridges State Marine Reserve

Area (sq. mi.): 0.58

Along-shore span (mi): 4.1

Depth range (ft): 0-21

Primary habitat types: sandy beach, rocky intertidal, surfgrass.

Proposed regulations: No take.

Boundaries: This area is bounded by the mean high tide line and a distance of 200 feet seaward of the mean low tide line between the following two points (Figure 7):

36° 57.90' N. lat. 122° 07.65' W. long.; and

36° 57.00' N. lat. 122° 03.50' W. long.

Examples of species likely to benefit: limpets, mussels, clams, snails, algae.

Rationale: Provide complete protection to a rocky and soft bottom intertidal area in close proximity to a research institution and provide an opportunity for comparative studies here and

Deleted: July 21, 2006 Page


in an adjacent intertidal state marine park. This area would provide protection for intertidal species while allowing take of species outside the intertidal zone.

Detailed Objectives (with reference to regional goal and objective):

- Protect species associated with high-diversity intertidal habitat and intertidal regions north of Monterey Bay. (Goal 1, Objective 1)
- Include areas with sand and gravel beaches, rocky intertidal, wave-cut platforms, exposed rocky cliffs, and salt marsh, in close proximity to each other. (Goal 1, Objective 2)
- Protect natural size and age structure and genetic diversity of populations of intertidal invertebrates, including owl limpets. (Goal 1, Objective 3)
- Protect natural trophic structure and food web of rocky intertidal communities, including mussel and surfgrass beds. (Goal 1, Objective 4)
- Protect larval source and enhance reproductive capacity of intertidal invertebrate species such as limpets, mussels, and turban snails. (Goal 2, Objective 2)
- Enhance educational/research use of accessible intertidal area by establishing a state marine reserve in a prime educational area, adjacent to two terrestrial state parks and the University of California, Santa Cruz. (Goal 3, Objective 1)
- Replicate intertidal habitat found at Año Nuevo State Marine Reserve and at a monitoring site, not within a marine protected area, at nearby Sand Hill Bluff. (Goal 3, Objective 2)
- Encourage continuation of research at a site historically monitored by high school students as part of the Long-term Monitoring Program and Experiential Training for Students (LiMPETS). (Goal 3, Objective 3)
- Provide the opportunity to study differences in relative abundance and size frequency of intertidal algal and invertebrate species within a state marine reserve compared with an adjacent state marine park with similar habitat. (Goal 3, Objective 3)
- Include, and replicate within marine protected areas, surfgrass and mussel beds found within Año Nuevo State Marine Reserve. (Goal 4, Objective 2)

Deleted: July 21, 2006 Page

Figure 7. Natural Bridges State Marine Reserve



Proposed MPA: Elkhorn Slough State Marine Reserve

Area (sq. mi.): 1.48

Along-shore span (mi): 4.4

Depth range (ft): 0-10

Primary habitat types: estuary, coastal marsh, tidal flats, shallow soft bottom.

Proposed regulations: No take.

Boundaries: This area includes the area below mean high tide within Elkhorn Slough and between longitude 121° 46.40' W. and latitude 36° 50.50' N (Figure 8).

Deleted: 7

Examples of species likely to benefit: leopard shark, surf perches, bat ray, starry flounder, crabs, gaper clams, ghost shrimp, mud shrimp, worms, eelgrass.

Summary of Objectives: Continue to provide complete protection for one of the few estuarine areas of the central coast and expand this protection to include the entire slough channel as opposed to one half of the channel as is presently included.

Deleted: July 21, 2006 Page

Detailed Objectives (with reference to regional goal and objective):

- Protect estuarine area with high bird diversity. (Goal 1, Objective 1)
- Protect communities associated with area with diversity of estuarine habitats, including open channels, mud flats, and eelgrass beds, in close proximity to each other. (Goal 1, Objective 2)
- Protect natural age, size structure, and genetic diversity of fish and invertebrate species characteristic of one of largest estuarine systems within the central coast, in particular elasmobranchs, flatfishes, gaper clams, and fat innkeeper worms. (Goal 1, Objective 3)
- Protect natural structure and food web of estuarine system, including invertebrate forage base for sea otters and marine birds. (Goal 1, Objective 4)
- Help protect listed marine birds and southern sea otter by protecting feeding, roosting, and nesting habitat. (Goal 2, Objective 1)
- Enhance reproductive capacity of both invertebrate and fish species by prohibiting take in important nursery area. (Goal 2, Objective 2)
- Provide increased research and education opportunities by expanding an existing state marine reserve in an area adjacent to educational and interpretive facilities of the National Estuarine Research Reserve and Moss Landing Marine Laboratories. (Goal 3, Objective 1)
- Include and replicate representative estuarine habitat in central coast region within a state marine reserve. (Goal 3, Objective 2)
- Include estuarine habitat within a state marine reserve. (Goal 4, Objective 1)

Deleted: Protect


Deleted: Protect

Deleted: ¶
Page Break

Deleted: July 21, 2006 Page

Figure 8. Elkhorn Slough State Marine Reserve, Elkhorn Slough State Marine Park, and Morro Cojo Lagoon State Marine Reserve.

Deleted: 7



Deleted: Morro

Deleted: Lagoon

Proposed MPA: Elkhorn Slough State Marine Park

Area (sq. mi.): 0.09

Along-shore span (mi): 1.4

Depth range (ft): 0-10

Primary habitat types: estuary, coastal marsh, tidal flats, shallow soft bottom.

Proposed regulations: Take of all living marine resources is prohibited except the recreational take of finfish by hook-and-line, and the recreational take of clams in the area adjacent to the Department of Fish and Game Wildlife Area on the north shore of the slough.

Boundaries: This area includes the area below mean high tide within Elkhorn Slough between the Highway 1 Bridge and longitude 121° 46.40' W. (Figure 8).

Deleted: 7

Examples of species likely to benefit: crabs, ghost shrimp, mud shrimp, worms, eelgrass.

Summary of Objectives: Provide increased protection for one of the few estuarine areas of the central coast while allow for traditional uses of recreational fishing. The intent of the area is

Deleted: July 21, 2006 Page

to allow small scale recreational fishing activities to continue, while limiting any future increases in use that do not presently occur. The area will also prohibit take of clams in an area used by sea otters for foraging, potentially providing more available prey for the otters.

Detailed Objectives (with reference to regional goal and objective):

- Protect estuarine area with high bird diversity. (Goal 1, Objective 1)
- Protect communities associated with area with diversity of estuarine habitats, including open channels, mud flats, and eelgrass beds, in close proximity to each other. (Goal 1, Objective 2)
- Protect natural age, size structure, and genetic diversity of some invertebrate species, such as fat innkeeper worms, characteristic of one of largest estuarine systems within the central coast. (Goal 1, Objective 3)
- Provide for traditional recreational consumptive and nonconsumptive uses while offering some protection due to the prohibition of commercial fishing. (Goal 2, Objective 3)

Proposed MPA: Moro Cojo Slough State Marine Reserve

Area (sq. mi.): 0.46

Along-shore span (mi): 5.0

Depth range (ft): 0-10

Primary habitat types: estuary, tidal flats, shallow soft bottom.

Proposed regulations: No take.

Boundaries: This area includes the area within Moro Cojo Slough below mean high tide and between the Highway 1 Bridge and the crossing of the Southern Pacific Railroad tracks (Figure 8).

Deleted: 7

Examples of species likely to benefit: surfperches, snails, eelgrass.

Summary of Objectives: Provide complete protection for one of the few estuarine areas of the central coast. A recent grant to the North Monterey County Recreation and Park District will create more than three miles of nature trails and interpretive stations within the slough; the additional protection provided by the reserve will help ensure this increased access does not lead to new take of living resources.

Detailed Objectives (with reference to regional goal and objective):

- Help protect listed marine birds by protecting feeding, roosting, and nesting habitat. (Goal 2, Objective 1)
- Include and replicate representative estuarine habitat in central coast region within a state marine reserve. (Goal 3, Objective 2)
- Include estuarine habitat within a state marine reserve. (Goal 4, Objective 1)

Deleted: Protect

Deleted: Protect

Deleted: July 21, 2006 Page

Proposed MPA: Soquel Canyon State Marine Conservation Area

Area (sq. mi.): 23.41

Along-shore span (mi): 7.2

Depth range (ft): 247-2113

Deleted: 39

Primary habitat types: shallow hard and soft bottom, deep hard and soft bottom, deep canyon.

Proposed regulations: Take of all living marine resources is prohibited except the commercial and recreational take of pelagic finfish. **Note: an alternative is provided that allows the commercial take of spot prawn within this MPA. Final Commission decision will determine the regulations.**

Deleted: and

Deleted: by trap

Boundaries: This area is bounded by straight lines connecting the following points in the order listed (Figure 9):

36° 51.00' N. lat. 121° 56.00' W. long.;

36° 51.00' N. lat. 122° 03.80' W. long.;

36° 48.00' N. lat. 122° 02.88' W. long.;

36° 48.00' N. lat. 121° 56.00' W. long.; and

36° 51.00' N. lat. 121° 56.00' W. long.

Deleted: 8

Examples of species likely to benefit: shelf and slope rockfishes, lingcod, Dover sole, spot prawn, squid.

Summary of Objectives: Provide increased protection to shallow and deep complex submarine canyon habitat and the majority of associated benthic species. The Soquel Canyon area is important to the formation of an ecologically sound MPA network component, by linking these habitats to similar habitats in other parts of the region.

Deleted: This area would allow the continued take of spot prawn by trap and allow comparisons with an area that precludes this take just to the south (Portuguese Ledge).

Detailed Objectives (with reference to regional goal and objective):

- Protect area with high species diversity associated with submarine canyon, including depth-stratified species assemblages with shelf and slope rockfishes. (Goal 1, Objective 1)
- Help protect communities associated with area of diverse habitat including shallow hard and soft bottom, deep hard and soft bottom, and submarine canyon, over a large depth range, and in close proximity to each other. (Goal 1, Objective 2)
- Help restore overfished groundfish species by maintaining large individuals of species such as bocaccio, canary, and yelloweye rockfishes in an area that serves as a natural refuge for these species due to inaccessible vertical rock outcrops in a submarine canyon. (Goal 1, Objective 3)
- Protect overfished rockfishes, including bocaccio, canary, and yelloweye. (Goal 2, Objective 1)
- Enhance reproductive capacity of benthic and deepwater fish species by prohibiting fishing for these species and allowing only fisheries with limited bycatch of these species. (Goal 2, Objective 2)
- Protect rockfishes and other components of a deep benthic community, while allowing the harvest of pelagic finfish, (Goal 2, Objective 3)

Deleted: and spot prawn

Deleted: July 21, 2006 Page

- Enhance education and study opportunities by establishing a marine protected area near the Monterey Bay Aquarium Research Institute and Moss Landing Marine Laboratories where remotely operated vehicles, a future Monterey Accelerated Research System (MARS) cable, and other research methods have already generated baseline data. (Goal 3, Objective 1)
- Provide replicate deepwater hard bottom, soft bottom and submarine canyon habitats, in which fishing for benthic finfish species is prohibited, for Portuguese Ledge and Point Lobos State Marine Conservation Areas and Big Creek State Marine Reserve. (Goal 3, Objective 2)
- Include submarine canyon head habitat within a marine protected area. (Goal 4, Objective 1)
- Include and replicate deepwater hard and soft bottom and submarine canyon habitats across a wide range of depth. (Goal 4, Objective 2)
- Minimize negative socio-economic impacts to the pelagic finfish fisheries while protecting benthic finfishes within a marine protected area. (Goal 5, Objective 1)
- Minimize negative socio-economic impacts to rockfish fisheries by establishing a state marine conservation area in an area which encompasses part of the Rockfish Conservation Area, which is already closed to rockfish fishing. (Goal 5, Objective 1)
- Establish marine protected areas that meet Master Plan Framework scientific guidelines regarding preferred size (greater than 18 square miles). (Goal 5, Objective 3)


Deleted: Protect

Deleted: Protect

Deleted: and spot prawn

Figure 9. Soquel Canyon State Marine Conservation Area and Portuguese Ledge State Marine Conservation Area.

Deleted: 8



Deleted: —Page Break—

Deleted: July 21, 2006 Page

Proposed MPA: Portuguese Ledge State Marine Conservation Area

Area (sq. mi.): 10.90

Deleted: 19.82

Along-shore span (mi): 5.4

Depth range (ft): 302-4838

Primary habitat types: shallow hard and soft bottom, deep hard and soft bottom, deep submarine canyon.

Proposed regulations: Take of all living marine resources is prohibited except the commercial and recreational take of pelagic finfish. Note: an alternative is provided that allows the commercial take of spot prawn within this MPA. Final Commission decision will determine the regulations.

Boundaries: This area is bounded by straight lines connecting the following points in the order listed (Figure 9):

36° 43.00' N. lat. 121° 56.00' W. long.;

Deleted: 8

36° 43.00' N. lat. 122° 01.30' W. long.;

Deleted: 44.50'

36° 41.00' N. lat. 122° 00.80' W. long.;

Deleted: 44.50'

36° 41.00' N. lat. 121° 56.00' W. long.; and

Deleted: 85'

36° 43.00' N. lat. 121° 56.00' W. long.

Deleted: 44.50'

Examples of species likely to benefit: shelf and slope rockfishes, lingcod, Dover sole, Dungeness crab, spot prawn, squid.

Summary of Objectives: Provide increased protection to deep submarine canyon, other deep hard and soft habitat, and all associated benthic species. This area is important to the formation of an ecologically sound MPA network component, by linking these habitats to similar habitats in other parts of the region.

Deleted: would prohibit the take of spot prawn by trap and allow comparisons with an area that allows this take just to the north (Soquel Canyon). This area

Detailed Objectives (with reference to regional goal and objective):

- Protect area with high species diversity associated with submarine canyon, including depth-stratified species assemblages with shelf and slope rockfishes. (Goal 1, Objective 1)
- Help protect communities associated with area of diverse habitat including shallow hard and soft bottom, deep hard and soft bottom, and submarine canyon, over a large depth range, and in close proximity to each other. (Goal 1, Objective 2)
- Help restore overfished groundfish species by maintaining large individuals of species such as bocaccio, canary, and yelloweye rockfishes in an area that has been fished heavily for decades and has become less productive. (Goal 1, Objective 3)
- Protect overfished rockfishes, including bocaccio, canary, and yelloweye. (Goal 2, Objective 1)
- Enhance reproductive capacity of benthic and deepwater fish and invertebrate species by prohibiting fishing for these species and allowing fisheries with limited bycatch of these species. (Goal 2, Objective 2)
- Protect rockfishes and other components of a deep benthic community, while allowing the harvest of pelagic finfish. (Goal 2, Objective 3)

Deleted: July 21, 2006 Page

- Enhance education and study opportunities by establishing a marine protected area near the Monterey Bay Aquarium Research Institute and Moss Landing Marine Laboratories where remotely operated vehicles and other research methods have already generated baseline data. (Goal 3, Objective 1)
- Provide replicate deepwater hard bottom, soft bottom and submarine canyon habitats, in which fishing for benthic species is prohibited, for Soquel Canyon and Point Lobos State Marine Conservation Areas and Big Creek State Marine Reserve. (Goal 3, Objective 2)
- Include and replicate deepwater hard and soft bottom and submarine canyon habitats across a wide range of depth. (Goal 4, Objective 2)
- Minimize negative socio-economic impacts to the pelagic finfish fisheries while protecting benthic habitat within a marine protected area. (Goal 5, Objective 1)
- Minimize negative socio-economic impacts to rockfish fisheries by establishing a state marine conservation area in an area which encompasses the Rockfish Conservation Area, which is already closed to rockfish fishing. (Goal 5, Objective 1)
- Establish marine protected areas that meet Master Plan Framework scientific guidelines regarding preferred size (greater than 18 square miles). (Goal 5, Objective 3)

Deleted: Protect

Proposed MPA: Edward F. Ricketts State Marine Conservation Area
Area (sq. mi.): 0.22
Along-shore span (mi): 1
Depth range (ft): 0-74

Deleted: Ed

Primary habitat types: sandy beach, rocky intertidal, surfgrass, shallow hard and soft bottom, kelp bed.

Proposed regulations: Take of all living marine resources is prohibited except the recreational take of finfish by hook-and-line and, north of 36° 36.83' N. Latitude, the commercial take of kelp by hand. Any individual licensed commercial kelp harvester may take no more than 12 tons of kelp from the portion of Administrative Kelp Bed 220 within the Edward F. Ricketts State Marine Conservation Area in any calendar month. **Note: alternatives are provided that may limit recreational fishing from the Monterey Breakwater to specific times and days of the week with special allowances for disabled anglers. Final Commission decision will determine the regulations.**

Deleted: 38

Deleted: Ed Ricketts

Boundaries: This area is bounded by the mean high tide line and straight lines connecting the following points in the order listed (Figure 10):
 36° 36.50' N. lat. 121° 53.37' W. long.;
 36° 37.25' N. lat. 121° 53.78' W. long.; and
 36° 37.10' N. lat. 121° 54. 09' W. long.

Deleted: 9

Deleted: 01'

Examples of species likely to benefit: mussels, limpets, turban snails, sea stars.

Summary of Objectives: Provide increased protection to a heavily-used area with shallow hard and soft bottom habitats, including kelp beds, while allowing for some traditional consumptive uses. The primary purpose of this area is to provide for recreational opportunities (both consumptive and nonconsumptive) in an area that is minimally impacted by other consumptive activities.

Deleted: July 21, 2006 Page

Detailed Objectives (with reference to regional goal and objective):

- Protect invertebrates and the habitats on which they depend while allowing the harvest of finfish and kelp. (Goal 2, Objective 3)
- Enhance research and study opportunities by establishing a marine protected area which allows hook-and-line fishing and prohibits spearfishing close to Lovers Point State Marine Reserve and close to a state marine conservation area which allows spearfishing. (Goal 3, Objective 1)
- Promote opportunity for use of volunteer scuba divers in research and monitoring projects by establishing a state marine conservation area in a location heavily used by scuba divers where volunteer monitoring by REEF already takes place. (Goal 3, Objective 3)
- Minimize negative socio-economic impacts by establishing a state marine conservation area which allows recreational fishing and hand harvest of kelp by local aquaculturists, while affording protection to invertebrates and prohibiting all other commercial take. (Goal 5, Objective 1)

Deleted: Page Break

Deleted: selected

Deleted: Hopkins

Figure 10. Edward F. Ricketts State Marine Conservation Area, Lovers Point State Marine Reserve, Pacific Grove Marine Gardens State Marine Conservation Area, and Asilomar State Marine Reserve.

Deleted: 9. Ed

Deleted: Hopkins

Deleted: and

Deleted: .


Deleted: <sp>¶
¶
<sp>

Deleted: ¶

¶
¶
¶
¶

Hopkins

Deleted: Ed



Deleted: July 21, 2006 Page

Proposed MPA: Lovers Point State Marine Reserve

Deleted: Hopkins

Area (sq. mi.): 0.30

Along-shore span (mi): 1.0

Depth range (ft): 0-88

Primary habitat types: sandy beach, rocky intertidal, surfgrass, shallow hard and soft bottom, kelp bed.

Proposed regulations: No take.

Boundaries: This area is bounded by the mean high tide line and straight lines connecting the following points in the order listed (Figure 10):

Deleted: 9

36° 37.10' N. lat. 121° 54. 09' W. long.;

Deleted: 01'

36° 37.25' N. lat. 121° 53.78' W. long.;

36° 37.38' N. lat. 121° 53.85' W. long.;

36° 37.60' N. lat. 121° 54.75' W. long.; and

36° 37.60' N. lat. 121° 54.91' W. long.

Examples of species likely to benefit: nearshore rockfishes, lingcod, cabezon, kelp greenling, surfperches, California halibut, giant kelp, mussels, limpets, sea stars, southern sea otter, cormorants.

Summary of Objectives: Provide for increased protection through the expansion of an existing state marine reserve in shallow hard and soft bottom habitats in an area close to population centers and used by nonconsumptive divers. The primary goal of this MPA will be to provide for recreational nonconsumptive uses in an area minimally impacted by human take. Additionally this increases the area adjacent to an existing research institution which can facilitate research and monitoring within the MPA.

Detailed Objectives (with reference to regional goal and objective):

- Continue to provide protection to a rich diversity of invertebrates and fish species characteristic of shallow rocky and soft bottom habitat of southern Monterey Bay, while expanding protection to a small reef in slightly deeper water. (Goal 1, Objective1)
- Help protect southern sea otter and marine bird habitat. (Goal 2, Objective 1)
- Protect large individuals of resident nearshore fish species in known nursery area. (Goal 2, Objective 2)
- Enhance scientific research opportunities at site of traditional high research value by expanding protection in adjacent areas and extending the existing state marine reserve alongshore and into deeper water. (Goal 3, Objective 1)
- Enhance recreational non-consumptive diving experience at site of traditional high diving use by expanding protection in adjacent areas and extending the existing state marine reserve alongshore and into deeper water. (Goal 3, Objective 1)
- Benefit from site's location adjacent to Stanford University's Hopkins Marine Station and its use by students for educational and monitoring purposes. (Goal 3, Objective 3)
- Minimize socio-economic impacts by limiting the state marine reserve to a maximum depth of approximately 60 feet (except for Hopkins Deep Reef) which will allow

Deleted: July 21, 2006 Page

continued commercial and recreational fishing in deeper waters adjacent to the state marine reserve. (Goal 5, Objective 1)

Proposed MPA: Pacific Grove Marine Gardens State Marine Conservation Area

Area (sq. mi.): 0.93

Deleted: 2.44

Along-shore span (mi): 3.8

Depth range (ft): 0-172

Primary habitat types: sandy beach, rocky intertidal, surfgrass, shallow hard and soft bottom, kelp bed.

Proposed regulations: Take of all living marine resources is prohibited except recreational take of finfish and the commercial take of kelp by hand. Any individual licensed commercial kelp harvester may take no more than 44 tons of kelp from the portion of Administrative Kelp Bed 220 within the Pacific Grove Marine Gardens State Marine Conservation Area in any calendar month.

Boundaries: This area is bounded by the mean high tide line and straight lines connecting the following points in the order listed (Figure 10):

Deleted: 9

36° 37.60' N. lat. 121° 54.91' W. long.;

36° 37.60' N. lat. 121° 54.75' W. long.;

36° 38.70' N. lat. 121° 55.40' W. long.;

36° 38.90' N. lat. 121° 56.60' W. long.; and

36° 38.22' N. lat. 121° 56.15' W. long.

Deleted: 36.60'

Deleted: 57.50'

Examples of species likely to benefit: invertebrates, including mussels, limpets, turban snails, sea stars, squid.

Summary of Objectives: Provide increased protection to a heavily-used area with shallow hard and soft bottom habitats, including kelp beds, while allowing for some traditional consumptive uses. The primary purpose of this area is to provide for recreational opportunities (both consumptive and nonconsumptive) in an area that is minimally impacted by other consumptive activities.

Detailed Objectives (with reference to regional goal and objective):

- Enhance non-consumptive recreational experience by prohibiting commercial finfishing and all invertebrate take in an area that includes traditional scuba diving sites accessed from the beach or boats. (Goal 3, Objective 1)
- Continue to protect, within a state marine conservation area, an area close to Monterey and adjacent to Pacific Grove that has long-standing and strong community support and high research, educational and recreational value, particularly with respect to tide pools. (Goal 3, Objective 1)
- Provide potential opportunity to study impacts of the hand harvest of kelp and spearfishing by establishing an expanded state marine reserve and a state marine conservation area (which also allows hand harvest of kelp and prohibits spearfishing) adjacent or near to this site. (Goal 3, Objective 2)
- Promote opportunity for use of volunteer scuba divers in research and monitoring projects by establishing a state marine conservation area in a location heavily used by

Deleted: July 21, 2006 Page

scuba divers where volunteer monitoring by REEF already takes place. (Goal 3, Objective 3)

- Enhance recreational fishing within the state marine conservation area through a prohibition on commercial take and by providing for a natural size and age structure of resident finfish species in an adjacent state marine reserve. (Goal 3, Objective 4)
- Allow continued recreational fishing in traditional use area and hand harvest of kelp close to abalone aquaculture facilities. (Goal 5, Objective 1)

Proposed MPA: Asilomar State Marine Reserve

Area (sq. mi.): 1.51

Along-shore span (mi): 2.3

Depth range (ft): 0-172

Primary habitat types: sandy beach, rocky intertidal, surfgrass, shallow hard and soft bottom, kelp bed.

Proposed regulations: No take

Boundaries: This area is bounded by the mean high tide line and straight lines connecting the following points in the order listed (Figure 10):

36° 38.22' N. lat. 121° 56.15' W. long.;

36° 38.90' N. lat. 121° 56.60' W. long.; and

36° 36.60' N. lat. 121° 57.50' W. long.;

Examples of species likely to benefit: nearshore rockfishes, lingcod, cabezon, kelp greenling, surfperches, California halibut, giant kelp, mussels, limpets, sea stars, southern sea otter, cormorants.

Rationale: Provide for complete protection in shallow hard and soft bottom habitats in an area close to population centers and used by nonconsumptive divers. The primary goals of this MPA will be to provide for recreational nonconsumptive uses in an area minimally impacted by human take, and to provide benefits to an adjacent fished area through spillover of adult fishes and increased potential for larval production.

Detailed Objectives (with reference to regional goal and objective):

- Provide protection to a rich diversity of invertebrates and fish species characteristic of shallow rocky and soft bottom habitat near southern Monterey Bay. (Goal 1, Objective1)
- Help protect southern sea otter and marine bird habitat. (Goal 2, Objective 1)
- Protect large individuals of resident nearshore fish species adjacent to an area which experiences significant recreational fishing effort. (Goal 2, Objective 2)
- Enhance recreational non-consumptive diving experience at site of traditional diving use. (Goal 3, Objective 1)
- Benefit from site's location close to Stanford University's Hopkins Marine Station and its use by students for educational and monitoring purposes. (Goal 3, Objective 3)
- Minimize socio-economic impacts by limiting the state marine reserve to an area which is primarily less than 90 feet deep, which will allow continued commercial and

Deleted: July 21, 2006 Page

recreational fishing in deeper waters adjacent to the state marine reserve. (Goal 5, Objective 1)

Proposed MPA: Carmel Pinnacles State Marine Reserve

Area (sq. mi.): 0.53

Along-shore span (mi): 1.0

Depth range (ft): 69-223

Primary habitat types: rocky pinnacles, kelp bed.

Proposed regulations: No take.

Boundaries: This area is bounded by the straight lines connecting the following points in the order listed (Figure 11):

36° 33.65' N. lat. 121° 57.60' W. long.;
36° 33.65' N. lat. 121° 58.50' W. long.;
36° 33.10' N. lat. 121° 58.50' W. long.;
36° 33.10' N. lat. 121° 57.60' W. long.; and
36° 33.65' N. lat. 121° 57.60' W. long.;

Deleted: 10

Examples of species likely to benefit: nearshore rockfishes, lingcod, cabezon, kelp greenling, surfperches, giant kelp, bull kelp, sponges, hydrocorals.

Summary of Objectives: Provide for complete protection in an area of complex hard bottom habitat, including kelp beds and pinnacles, is close to port and frequently used by nonconsumptive divers. The primary purpose of this area would be to protect a unique pinnacle area that is accessible to divers for nonconsumptive uses while maintaining similar habitats nearby as open fishing areas.


Detailed Objectives (with reference to regional goal and objective):

- Protect communities associated with high-relief rocky reef habitat (including pinnacles), bull kelp and giant kelp forests, and hydrocorals, in close proximity to each other. (Goal 1, Objective 2)
- Enhance non-consumptive recreational scuba diving experience at a traditional dive site formerly open to fishing. (Goal 3, Objective 1)
- Replicate pinnacle habitat found within Point Lobos State Marine Reserve. (Goal 3, Objective 2)
- Include pinnacle habitat, with dense rockfish populations, sponges, and hydrocorals, within a state marine reserve. (Goal 4, Objective 1)

Deleted: Protect

Deleted: July 21, 2006 Page

Figure 11. Carmel Pinnacles State Marine Conservation Area, Carmel Bay State Marine Conservation Area, Point Lobos State Marine Reserve, and Point Lobos State Marine Conservation Area.



Proposed MPA: Carmel Bay State Marine Conservation Area

Area (sq. mi.): 2.12

Along-shore span (mi): 3.5

Depth range (ft): 0-471

Primary habitat types: sandy beach, rocky intertidal, surfgrass, shallow hard and soft bottom, submarine canyon head, kelp bed.

Proposed regulations: Take of all living marine resources is prohibited except the recreational take of finfish and the commercial take of giant kelp (*Macrocystis pyrifera*) by hand. Any individual licensed commercial kelp harvester may take no more than 44 tons of kelp from the portion of Administrative Kelp Bed 219 within the Carmel Bay State Marine Conservation Area in any calendar month.

Boundaries: This area is bounded by the mean high tide line and straight lines connecting the following points in the order listed (Figure 11):

36° 33.65' N. lat. 121° 57.10' W. long.;

36° 31.70' N. lat. 121° 56.30' W. long.; and

36° 31.70' N. lat. 121° 55.55' W. long.

Examples of species likely to benefit: invertebrates, including squid.

Deleted: -----Page Break-----

Summary of Objectives: Continue to provide existing level of protection in an area of diverse shallow habitat characterized by traditional recreational uses.

Detailed Objectives (with reference to regional goal and objective):

- Allow continued recreational harvest of finfish and commercial harvest of kelp by hand in an area of historic recreational use value near Monterey harbor while protecting invertebrates. (Goal 2, Objective 3)
- Maintain an existing state marine conservation area located near the population center of Monterey Peninsula that is accessible for recreational opportunities, both consumptive and non-consumptive. (Goal 3, Objective 1)
- Maintain an existing state marine conservation area that includes a Moss Landing Marine Laboratories long-term monitoring site. (Goal 3, Objective 3)
- Allow for the comparison of a recreational fishing area adjacent to a no-take area (Goal 3, Objective 3)

Proposed MPA: Point Lobos State Marine Reserve

Area (sq. mi.): 5.36

Along-shore span (mi): 4.7

Depth range (ft): 0-408

Deleted: <#>Maintain the general size and shape of the existing state marine conservation area so it will not result in any additional negative socio-economic impact. (Goal 5, Objective 1)
¶

Primary habitat types: sandy beach, rocky intertidal, surfgrass, shallow hard and soft bottom, pinnacles, kelp bed.

Proposed regulations: No take. Access restricted in some areas due to existing Point Lobos State [Reserve \(State Park Unit\)](#) regulations but these restrictions will not apply to areas outside the existing Pt. Lobos State [Reserve \(State Park Unit\)](#) boundaries.

Boundaries: This area is bounded by the mean high tide line and straight lines connecting the following points in the order listed (Figure [11](#)):

36° 31.70' N. lat. 121° 55.55' W. long.;

36° 31.70' N. lat. 121° 58.25' W. long.;

36° 28.88' N. lat. 121° 58.25' W. long.; and

36° 28.88' N. lat. 121° 56.30' W. long.

Deleted: 10

Examples of species likely to benefit: nearshore rockfishes, lingcod, cabezon, kelp greenling, surfperches, giant kelp, bull kelp, squid, sponges, hydrocorals, cormorants, pelicans, southern sea otter, harbor seal.

Summary of Objectives: Provide for increased complete protection through the expansion of an existing state marine reserve in shallow hard and soft bottom habitats in an area close to population centers and used by nonconsumptive divers. This area is important to the formation of an ecologically sound MPA network component, by linking these habitats to similar habitats in other parts of the region.

Deleted: July 21, 2006 Page

Detailed Objectives (with reference to regional goal and objective):

- Protect area of high species diversity characteristic of the granitic shallow hard bottom habitat within the central coast, and maintain species diversity and abundance as demonstrated by monitoring indicator species. (Goal 1, Objective 1)
- Protect communities associated with a mosaic of sandy and rocky intertidal, kelp bed, shallow rocky reef, shallow sandy bottom, and submarine canyon head habitats in close proximity to each other. (Goal 1, Objective 2)
- Protect natural age and size structure of invertebrate and fish species associated with sandy and rocky intertidal, kelp bed, shallow rocky reef, shallow sandy bottom, and submarine canyon head habitat. (Goal 1, Objective 3)
- Protect natural trophic structure and food webs, including forage species such as squid and coastal pelagic finfish that serve as prey for other fish, marine birds, and marine mammals. (Goal 1, Objective 4)
- Protect ecosystem structure and functions associated with submarine canyon head, rocky reef, and kelp forest communities. (Goal 1, Objective 5)
- Help protect listed marine bird and marine mammal species by protecting forage base. (Goal 2, Objective 1)
- Protect larval sources and enhance reproductive capacity of invertebrates and nearshore finfish with limited movement patterns. (Goal 2, Objective 2)
- Enhance extensive educational and interpretive facilities, including visitor center and docent program, through expansion of an existing state marine reserve. (Goal 3, Objective 1)
- Enhance Partnership for Interdisciplinary Studies of Coastal Oceans (PISCO) monitoring program (which has existing replicate monitoring sites inside and outside the state marine reserve) through expansion of the existing state marine reserve. (Goal 3, Objective 2)
- Replicate pinnacles habitat found in Carmel Pinnacles State Marine Reserve. (Goal 3, Objective 2)
- Enhance existing local high school monitoring program through expansion of the state marine reserve. (Goal 3, Objective 3)
- Protect and enhance recreational diving experience by expanding protection of existing state marine reserve to better ensure protection of large fish. (Goal 3, Objective 4)
- Protect head of Carmel Submarine Canyon and pinnacle habitats within a state marine reserve. (Goal 4, Objective 1)
- Include rocky intertidal, kelp bed, shallow rocky reef, and shallow soft bottom habitats within a state marine reserve, and increase protection of pinnacle habitat. (Goal 4, Objective 2)
- Optimize positive socio-economic benefits by improving protection in area that has particularly high non-consumptive use patterns, including scuba diving and wildlife watching. (Goal 5, Objective 1)
- Establish a marine protected area complex (along with Point Lobos State Marine Conservation Area) that meets Master Plan Framework scientific guidelines for minimum shoreline extent and offshore extent. (Goal 5, Objective 3)

Deleted: Protect

Deleted: high-value

Deleted: by expansion of existing reserve to the south

Deleted: <#>Minimize negative socio-economic impacts by expanding the existing state marine reserve rather than establishing a new one and by considering existing spot prawn fishery. (Goal 5, Objective 1)¶

Deleted: July 21, 2006 Page

Proposed MPA: Point Lobos State Marine Conservation Area

Area (sq. mi.): 8.85

Along-shore span (mi): 3.2

Depth range (ft): 268-1858

Primary habitat types: shallow and deep hard bottom, shallow and deep soft bottom, shallow and deep submarine canyon.

Proposed regulations: Take of all living marine resources is prohibited except commercial and recreational take of salmon (*Oncorhynchus spp.*), albacore (*Thunnus alalunga*), and spot prawn (*Pandalus platyceros*).

Boundaries: This area is bounded by the state water line offshore and straight lines connecting the following points in the order listed unless otherwise stated (Figure 11):

36° 31.70' N. lat. 121° 58.25' W. long.;

36° 31.70' N. lat. 122° 01.30' W. long.; thence southward along the state water line to

36° 28.88' N. lat. 122° 00.55' W. long.;

36° 28.88' N. lat. 121° 58.25' W. long.; and

36° 31.70' N. lat. 121° 58.25' W. long.

Deleted: 10

Deleted: 01.37'

Examples of species likely to benefit: shelf and slope rockfishes, lingcod, sponges, hydrocorals, cormorants, pelicans, southern sea otter, harbor seal.

Summary of Objectives: Provide for increased protection of benthic finfishes in a diverse area containing shallow and deep, and hard and soft habitats, while minimizing impact to rockfish fisheries, through the incorporation of part of the Rockfish Conservation Area into the MPA, and salmon and spot prawn fisheries. This area is important to the formation of an ecologically sound MPA network component, by linking these habitats to similar habitats in other parts of the region.

Detailed Objectives (with reference to regional goal and objective):

- Protect communities associated with area with shallow hard and soft bottom, deep hard and soft bottom, and shallow and deep submarine canyon habitats across a wide depth range and in close proximity to each other. (Goal 1, Objective 2)
- Help protect populations of overfished rockfish (including bocaccio, canary and yelloweye) and help protect forage species (including coastal pelagic finfish) for listed marine birds. (Goal 2, Objective 1)
- Enhance reproductive capacity of benthic fish species by prohibiting fishing for them in deep water. (Goal 2, Objective 2)
- Enhance reproductive capacity of benthic fish species by only allowing fishing for selected pelagic finfishes and spot prawn (by trap), where bycatch of benthic fishes is minimal. (Goal 2, Objective 2)
- Provide an opportunity for comparative studies in Soquel Canyon and Portuguese Ledge State Marine Conservation Areas which have similar habitats. (Goal 3, Objective 1)
- Minimize negative socio-economic impacts by allowing fishing for salmon, albacore and spot prawn, and by incorporating a portion of the Rockfish Conservation Area (closed to groundfish take) and Essential Fish Habitat trawl closure. (Goal 5, Objective 1)

Deleted: <#>Allow harvest of some species (salmon, albacore, and spot prawn) while providing buffer for improved protection of Point Lobos State Marine Reserve in deeper water. (Goal 2, Objective 3)¶

Deleted: <#>Provide (fished) replicate deepwater hard bottom, soft bottom and submarine canyon habitat for Portuguese Ledge and Big Creek State Marine Reserves. (Goal 3, Objective 2)¶

Deleted: July 21, 2006 Page

- Establish a marine protected area complex (along with Point Lobos State Marine Reserve) that meets Master Plan Framework scientific guidelines for minimum shoreline extent and offshore extent. (Goal 5, Objective 3)

Proposed MPA: Point Sur State Marine Reserve

Area (sq. mi.): 9.72

Along-shore span (mi): 5.2

Depth range (ft): 0-178

Deleted: 92

Deleted: 4.

Deleted: 181

Primary habitat types: sandy beach, rocky intertidal, surfgrass, shallow hard and soft bottom, kelp bed, canyon head.

Proposed regulations: No take.

Boundaries: This area is bounded by the mean high tide line and straight lines connecting the following points in the order listed (Figure 12):

36° 18.40' N. lat. 121° 54.10' W. long.;

36° 18.40' N. lat. 121° 56.00' W. long.;

36° 15.00' N. lat. 121° 52.50' W. long.; and

36° 15.00' N. lat. 121° 50.25' W. long.;

NOTE: An alternative boundary description is provided in the proposed regulations.

Final Commission action will determine the boundaries of this MPA.

Deleted: 11

Deleted: 20.60'

Deleted: 53.60'

Deleted: 20.60'

Deleted: 55.75' W. long.;
36° 18.26' N. lat. 121° 55.75'

Deleted: 53.75'

Deleted: and

Deleted: 36° 17.43' N. lat. 121°
52.58' W. long.;

Examples of species likely to benefit: nearshore and shelf rockfishes, lingcod, cabezon, kelp greenling, surfperches, giant kelp, bull kelp, squid, Dungeness crab, murre, guillemots, cormorants, petrels, auklets.

Summary of Objectives: Provide for complete protection of a diverse area containing shallow hard and soft habitats, kelp beds, and associated fish and invertebrate species while minimizing impact to shelf rockfish fisheries through the incorporation of part of the Rockfish Conservation Area into the MPA. This area is important to the formation of an ecologically sound MPA network component, by linking these habitats to similar habitats in other parts of the region.

Detailed Objectives (with reference to regional goal and objective):

- Protect area of particularly high species diversity associated with upwelling cell in lee of headland, as well as area immediately north of a headland, and maintain species diversity and abundance as demonstrated by monitoring indicator species. (Goal 1, Objective 1, and 2)
- Protect natural age and size structure of invertebrate and fish species associated with sandy beach, rocky intertidal, kelp bed, shallow rocky reef, and shallow sandy bottom habitat. (Goal 1, Objective 3)
- Protect natural trophic structure and food webs, including forage species such as juvenile rockfish, squid, and coastal pelagic finfish that serve as prey for other fish, marine birds, and marine mammals. (Goal 1, Objective 4)
- Provide protection to an area that contains a persistent upwelling plume and generally southerly flow, well-suited to provide larval dispersal to other areas. (Goal 1, Objective 5)

Deleted: -----Page Break-----

Deleted: July 21, 2006 Page


- Help protect populations of overfished rockfish species including bocaccio, yelloweye, and canary. (Goal 2, Objective 1)
- Protect forage base for listed marine birds and marine mammals as well as overfished rockfish species. (Goal 2, Objective 1)
- Protect larval sources and enhance reproductive capacity of shelf species including rockfishes. (Goal 2, Objective 2)
- Establish a marine protected area near a terrestrial state park where an adjacent PISCO subtidal monitoring site exists. (Goal 3, Objective 1)
- **Include** submarine canyon head habitat found in the Soquel Canyon and Point Lobos State Marine Conservation Areas and Point Lobos State Marine Reserve. (Goal 3, Objective 2)
- **Include** submarine canyon head within a state marine reserve. (Goal 4, Objective 1)
- **Include** shallow hard and soft bottom, and shallow canyon habitat within a state marine reserve, including an area of broad continental shelf within a larger area of primarily narrow continental shelf. (Goal 4, Objective 2)
- Minimize negative socio-economic impacts by incorporating a portion of the Rockfish Conservation Area (closed to groundfish take), and considering existing squid fishing grounds. (Goal 5, Objective 1)
- Establish a marine protected area complex (along with Point Sur State Marine Conservation Area) that meets preferred Master Plan Framework scientific guidelines for size. (Goal 5, Objective 3)

Deleted: Replicate

Deleted: Protect

Deleted: Protect

Figure 12. Pt. Sur State Marine Reserve and Pt. Sur State Marine Conservation Area.



Deleted: Page Break

Deleted: 11

Deleted: July 21, 2006 Page

Proposed MPA: Point Sur State Marine Conservation Area

Area (sq. mi.): 9.96

Along-shore span (mi): 5.2

Depth range (ft): 134-424

Deleted: 14.14

Deleted: 6.4

Deleted: 165-700

Primary habitat types: shallow hard and soft bottom.

Proposed regulations: Take of all living marine resources is prohibited except commercial and recreational take of salmon (*Oncorhynchus* spp.) and albacore (*Thunnus alalunga*).

Deleted: *Oncorhynchus*

Boundaries: This area is bounded by the state water line offshore and straight lines connecting the following points in the order listed unless otherwise stated (Figure 12):

36° 18.40' N. lat. 121° 56.00' W. long.;

36° 18.40' N. lat. 121° 58.33' W. long.; thence southward along the state water line to

36° 15.00' N. lat. 121° 55.10' W. long.;

36° 15.00' N. lat. 121° 52.50' W. long.; and

36° 18.40' N. lat. 121° 56.00' W. long.

Deleted: 11

Deleted: 20.60'

Deleted: 55.75'

Deleted: 20.60'

Deleted: 25'

Deleted: 14.45'

Deleted: 54.37'

Deleted: 50'

Deleted: 53.75'

Deleted: 20.60'

Deleted: 55.75'

NOTE: An alternative boundary description is provided in the proposed regulations.

Final Commission action will determine the boundaries of this MPA.

Examples of species likely to benefit: nearshore and shelf rockfishes, lingcod, cabezon, kelp greenling, surfperches, giant kelp, squid, Dungeness crab, spot prawn, murre, cormorants, southern sea otter.

Summary of Objectives: Provide for increased protection of a diverse area containing shallow hard and soft habitats, kelp beds, and associated fish and invertebrate species while minimizing impact to shelf rockfish fisheries, through the incorporation of part of the Rockfish Conservation Area into the MPA, and to the salmon fishery. This area is important to the formation of an ecologically sound MPA network component, by linking these habitats to similar habitats in other parts of the region. In addition, unique habitats in federal waters are adjacent to this area and may be connected if appropriate in future processes.

Detailed Objectives (with reference to regional goal and objective):

- Protect area of high species diversity associated with shallow hard and soft bottom habitats where the continental shelf is relatively broad. (Goal 1, Objective 1 and 2)
- Protect natural age and size structure of invertebrate and fish species associated with shallow rocky reef and soft bottom habitat. (Goal 1, Objective 3)
- Protect natural trophic structure and food webs, including forage species such as juvenile rockfish, squid, and coastal pelagic finfish that serve as prey for other fish, marine birds, and marine mammals. (Goal 1, Objective 4)
- Provide protection to communities associated with an area that contains a persistent upwelling plume and generally southerly flow, well-suited to provide larval dispersal to other areas. (Goal 1, Objective 5)
- Help maintain populations of overfished rockfish species including bocaccio, yelloweye, and canary. (Goal 2, Objective 1)

Deleted: July 21, 2006 Page

- Protect forage base for listed marine birds and marine mammals as well as overfished rockfish species. (Goal 2, Objective 1)
- Protect larval sources and enhance reproductive capacity of benthic shelf species including rockfishes. (Goal 2, Objective 2)
- Minimize negative socio-economic impacts by incorporating a portion of the Rockfish Conservation Area (closed to groundfish take), and by allowing the harvest of salmon and albacore. (Goal 5, Objective 1)
- Establish a marine protected area complex (along with Point Sur State Marine Reserve) that meets preferred Master Plan Framework scientific guidelines for size. (Goal 5, Objective 3)

Proposed MPA: Big Creek State Marine Conservation Area

Area (sq. mi.): ~~8~~

~~Deleted: 10.11~~

Along-shore span (mi): 2.5

Depth range (ft): 0-1964

Primary habitat types: sandy beach, rocky intertidal, surfgrass, shallow hard and soft bottom, deep hard and soft bottom, shallow and deep submarine canyon, pinnacles, kelp bed.

Proposed regulations: Take of all living marine resources is prohibited except the commercial and recreational take of salmon (*Oncorhynchus* spp.), albacore (*Thunnus alalunga*), and ~~the commercial take of~~ spot prawn (*Pandalus platyceros*).

~~Deleted: Oncorhynchus~~

~~Deleted:) west of a straight line connecting the following two points (approximately 25 fathoms):
36° 07.20' N. lat. 121° 39.00' W. long.; and
36° 05.20' N. lat. 121° 38.00' W. long.~~

Boundaries: This area is bounded by the state water line offshore and straight lines connecting the following points in the order listed unless otherwise stated (Figure 13):

~~36° 07.20' N. lat. 121° 39.00' W. long.;~~

~~36° 07.20' N. lat. 121° 42.90' W. long.; thence southward along the three nautical mile offshore boundary to~~

~~Deleted: 12~~

~~Deleted: °~~

~~36° 05.20' N. lat. 121° 41.24' W. long.;~~

~~Deleted: ° 38.00' W. long.;
36° 07.20' N. lat. 121°~~

~~36° 05.20' N. lat. 121° 38.00' W. long.; and~~

~~Deleted: state water line~~

~~36° 07.20' N. lat. 121° 39.00' W. long.~~

~~Deleted: °~~

~~Deleted: °~~

~~Deleted: and~~

~~Deleted: °~~

~~Deleted: ° 37.10'~~

Examples of species likely to benefit: nearshore, shelf, and slope rockfishes, lingcod, cabezon, kelp greenling, surfperches, squid, giant kelp, murre, cormorants, southern sea otter.


Summary of Objectives: Provide for increased protection of a diverse area containing shallow and deep, and hard and soft habitats, kelp beds, submarine canyons, and associated fish and invertebrate species while minimizing impact to shelf rockfish fisheries, through the incorporation of part of the Rockfish Conservation Area into the MPA, and to the spot prawn and salmon fisheries. This area is important to the formation of an ecologically sound MPA network component, by linking these habitats to similar habitats in other parts of the region.

Detailed Objectives (with reference to regional goal and objective):

- Protect area of high species diversity associated with shallow and deep water habitats, including submarine canyon. (Goal 1, Objective 1)

~~Deleted: July 21, 2006 Page~~

- Figure 13. Big Creek State Marine Reserve and Big Creek State Marine Conservation Area



Deleted: 12

Deleted: July 21, 2006 Page

Proposed MPA: Big Creek State Marine Reserve

Area (sq. mi.): 14.47

Along-shore span (mi): 6.1

Depth range (ft): 0-2393

Deleted: 12.35

Deleted: 3.3

Primary habitat types: sandy beach, rocky intertidal, surfgrass, shallow hard and soft bottom, deep hard and soft bottom, shallow and deep submarine canyon, pinnacles, kelp bed.

Proposed regulations: No take.

Boundaries: This area is bounded by the state water line offshore and straight lines connecting the following points in the order listed unless otherwise stated (Figure 13):

36° 07.20' N. lat. 121° 38.00' W. long.;

36° 07.20' N. lat. 121° 39.00' W. long.;

36° 05.20' N. lat. 121° 38.00' W. long.

36° 05.20' N. lat. 121° 41.25' W. long.; thence southward along the three nautical mile offshore boundary to

36° 02.65' N. lat. 121° 39.70' W. long.; and

36° 02.65' N. lat. 121° 35.13' W. long.

Deleted: 12

Deleted: ° 05

Deleted: ° 37.10'

Deleted: °

Deleted: °

Deleted: 24'

Deleted: state water line

Deleted: °

Deleted: °

Deleted: °

Deleted: °

Deleted: 15'

Examples of species likely to benefit: nearshore, shelf, and slope rockfishes, lingcod, cabezon, kelp greenling, surfperches, spot prawn, squid, giant kelp, murre, cormorants, southern sea otter.

Summary of Objectives: Provide for increased complete protection, through expansion of an existing state marine reserve, of a diverse area containing shallow and deep, and hard and soft habitats, kelp beds, submarine canyons, and associated fish and invertebrate species while minimizing impact to shelf rockfish fisheries through the incorporation of part of the Rockfish Conservation Area into the MPA. This area is important to the formation of an ecologically sound MPA network component, by linking these habitats to similar habitats in other parts of the region.

Detailed Objectives (with reference to regional goal and objective):

- Protect area of high species diversity associated with shallow and deep water habitats, including submarine canyon. (Goal 1, Objective 1)
- Protect communities associated with sandy beach, rocky intertidal, shallow hard and soft bottom, surfgrass and kelp beds, deep hard and soft bottom, and shallow and deep submarine canyon habitat in close proximity to each other. (Goal 1, Objective 2)
- Protect natural age and size structure of invertebrate and fish species associated with sandy and rocky intertidal, surfgrass and kelp beds, shallow and deep rocky reef, shallow and deep sandy bottom, and shallow and deep submarine canyon habitat. (Goal 1, Objective 3)
- Protect natural trophic structure and food webs, including forage species such as juvenile rockfish, squid, and coastal pelagic finfish that serve as prey for other fish, marine birds, and marine mammals. (Goal 1, Objective 4)

Deleted: July 21, 2006 Page

- Protect full range of ecosystem functions in an area between upwelling zones. (Goal 1, Objective 5)
- Help maintain populations of overfished rockfish species including bocaccio, yelloweye, and canary. (Goal 2, Objective 1)
- Protect forage base for listed marine birds and marine mammals as well as overfished rockfish species. (Goal 2, Objective 1)
- Protect larval sources and enhance reproductive capacity of deepwater species including rockfishes. (Goal 2, Objective 2)
- Expand existing state marine reserve adjacent to a terrestrial reserve run by the University of California, which provides research and educational opportunities and existing baseline data inside and outside of the state marine reserve. (Goal 3, Objective 1)
- Provide opportunities afforded by an adjacent terrestrial reserve, managed by the University of California, to link classroom curricula. (Goal 3, Objective 3)
- Provide opportunities for collaborative research projects involving commercial fishermen, including a possible study on the impact of salmon fishing. (Goal 3, Objective 3)
- Replicate within a state marine reserve the shallow habitat found in Point Lobos and Point Sur State Marine Reserves. (Goal 4, Objective 2)
- Minimize negative socio-economic impacts by incorporating a portion of the Rockfish Conservation Area (closed to groundfish take). (Goal 5, Objective 1)
- Establish a state marine reserve that meets Master Plan Framework scientific guidelines for size. (Goal 5, Objective 3)

Proposed MPA: Piedras Blancas State Marine Reserve

Area (sq. mi.): 10.4

Along-shore span (mi): 6.4

Depth range (ft): 0-157

Deleted: Page Break

Primary habitat types: sandy beach, rocky intertidal, surfgrass, shallow hard and soft bottom, kelp bed.

Proposed regulations: No take.

Boundaries: This area is bounded by the mean high tide line and straight lines connecting the following points in the order listed (Figure 14):

35° 42.85' N. lat. 121° 18.95' W. long.;

35° 42.85' N. lat. 121° 21.00' W. long.;

35° 39.15' N. lat. 121° 18.50' W. long.; and

35° 39.15' N. lat. 121° 14.45' W. long.

Deleted: 13

Examples of species likely to benefit: nearshore and shelf rockfishes, lingcod, cabezon, kelp greenling, surfperches, spot prawn, squid, giant kelp, murre, cormorants, pelicans, guillemots, southern sea otter.

Summary of Objectives: Provide for complete protection of a diverse area containing shallow hard and soft habitats, kelp beds, pinnacles, and associated fish and invertebrate species in an

Deleted: July 21, 2006 Page

area receiving increased public visitation due to marine mammal viewing opportunities. This area is important to the formation of an ecologically sound MPA network component, by linking these habitats to similar habitats in other parts of the region.

Detailed Objectives (with reference to regional goal and objective):

- Protect area of particularly high species diversity including fish, invertebrates, kelp, marine birds, and marine mammals, including major rookeries containing California sea lion, northern elephant seal, harbor seal, Stellar sea lion, and northern fur seal. (Goal 1, Objective 1)
- Protect communities associated with extensive and high value intertidal zone which will be subject to additional visitation due to conversion from private to public ownership of land. (Goal 1, Objective 1)
- Protect communities associated with a mosaic of habitat types, including sandy beach with diverse cobble size, rocky intertidal, surfgrass bed, kelp forest, pinnacles, and shallow hard and soft bottom, in close proximity to each other. (Goal 1, Objective 2)
- Protect natural age and size structure of species associated with sandy beach, rocky intertidal, surfgrass bed, kelp forest, pinnacles, and shallow hard and soft bottom habitat. (Goal 1, Objective 3)
- Protect natural trophic structure and food webs, including forage species such as juvenile rockfish, squid, and coastal pelagic finfish that serve as prey for other fish, marine birds, and marine mammals. (Goal 1, Objective 4)
- Protect forage base for marine birds and marine mammals and eliminate disturbances associated with fishing activities. (Goal 1, Objective 5)
- Protect communities associated with an upwelling zone where larval dispersion to other areas is likely. (Goal 1, Objective 5)
- Help protect populations of overfished rockfish species including bocaccio, yelloweye, and canary. (Goal 2, Objective 1)
- Protect larval sources and enhance reproductive capacity of nearshore fish and invertebrate species. (Goal 2, Objective 2)
- Replicate within a state marine reserve the range of habitats found at Point Sur and Point Buchon State Marine Reserves in an area that includes a PISCO monitoring site. (Goal 3, Objective 2)
- Enhance classroom component of research and monitoring as related to the Friends of the Elephant Seal organization. (Goal 3, Objective 3)
- Include pinnacle habitat within a state marine reserve. (Goal 4, Objective 1)
- Include and replicate sandy beach, rocky intertidal, surfgrass bed, kelp forest, pinnacles, and shallow hard and soft bottom habitat. (Goal 4, Objective 2)
- Increase positive socio-economic benefits by protecting an area with exceptionally high natural heritage values, including education, wildlife viewing, and tourism. (Goal 5, Objective 1)
- Establish a marine protected area complex (along with Piedras Blancas State Marine Conservation Area) that meets Master Plan Framework scientific guidelines for preferred size. (Goal 5, Objective 3)

Deleted: Steller

Deleted: <#>Establish a state marine reserve adjacent to a newly expanded terrestrial state park which has high visitor rates, interpretive facilities, docent presence, and parking. (Goal 3, Objective 1) ¶

Deleted: Protect

Deleted: July 21, 2006 Page

Figure 14. Piedras Blancas State Marine Reserve and Piedras Blancas State Marine Conservation Area

Deleted: 13



Proposed MPA: Piedras Blancas State Marine Conservation Area

Area (sq. mi.): 8.76

Along-shore span (mi): 4.9

Depth range (ft): 94-337

Primary habitat types: shallow hard and soft bottom.

Proposed regulations: Take of all living marine resources is prohibited except commercial and recreational take of salmon (*Oncorhynchus* spp.) and albacore (*Thunnus alalunga*).

Deleted: *Oncorhynchus*

Boundaries: This area is bounded by the state water line offshore and straight lines connecting the following points in the order listed unless otherwise stated (Figure 14):

Deleted: 13

35° 42.85' N. lat. 121° 21.00' W. long.;

35° 42.85' N. lat. 121° 22.85' W. long.; thence southward along the state water line to

35° 39.15' N. lat. 121° 20.90' W. long.;

Deleted: and

35° 39.15' N. lat. 121° 18.50' W. long.; and

35° 42.85' N. lat. 121° 21.00' W. long.

Examples of species likely to benefit: nearshore and shelf rockfishes, lingcod, cabezon, kelp greenling, surfperches, giant kelp, squid, Dungeness crab, murrens, cormorants, southern sea otter.

Deleted: July 21, 2006 Page

Summary of Objectives: Provide for increased protection of a diverse area containing shallow hard and soft habitats, kelp beds, pinnacles, and associated fish and invertebrate species in an area receiving increased public visitation due to marine mammal viewing opportunities, while minimizing impact to the salmon fishery. This area is important to the formation of an ecologically sound MPA network component, by linking these habitats to similar habitats in other parts of the region.

Detailed Objectives (with reference to regional goal and objective):

- Protect benthic areas with high species diversity and maintain benthic species diversity and abundance, consistent with natural fluctuations, of populations in shallow hard and soft bottom. (Goal 1, Objective 1)
- Protect communities associated with area with shallow hard and soft bottom in close proximity to each other. (Goal 1, Objective 2)
- Protect natural age and size structure of invertebrate and fish species associated with shallow rocky reef and soft bottom habitat. (Goal 1, Objective 3)
- Protect offshore forage base for seabird and marine mammal populations. (Goal 1, Objective 5)
- Help maintain populations of overfished rockfish species including bocaccio, yelloweye, and canary. (Goal 2, Objective 1)
- Protect larval sources and enhance reproductive capacity of benthic shelf species including rockfishes. (Goal 2, Objective 2)
- Establish a marine protected area complex (along with Piedras Blancas State Marine Reserve) that meets Master Plan Framework scientific guidelines for preferred size. (Goal 5, Objective 3)

Proposed MPA: Cambria State Marine Park

Area (sq. mi.): 6.26

Along-shore span (mi): 5.8

Depth range (ft): 0-105

~~Deleted: Reserve~~

~~Deleted: 3.23~~

~~Deleted: 3.1~~

~~Deleted: 137~~

Primary habitat types: sandy beach, rocky intertidal, surfgrass, shallow hard and soft bottom, kelp bed.

Proposed regulations: No commercial take. Recreational take is allowed.

~~Deleted: Take of all living marine resources~~

~~Deleted: prohibited~~

~~Deleted: 14):~~

~~Deleted: ° 32.50'~~

~~Deleted: ° 05.60'~~

~~Deleted: ° 32.50'~~

~~Deleted: ° 07.00'~~

Boundaries: This area is bounded by the mean high tide line and straight lines connecting the following points in the order listed (Figure 15).

35° 37.10' N. lat. 121° 09.20' W. long.;

35° 37.10' N. lat. 121° 10.70' W. long.;

35° 32.85' N. lat. 121° 06.70' W. long.; and

35° 32.85' N. lat. 121° 05.85' W. long.

NOTE: An alternative boundary description is provided in the proposed regulations. Final Commission action will determine the boundaries of this MPA.


~~Deleted: July 21, 2006 Page~~

Examples of species likely to benefit: squid, giant kelp.

Objectives (with reference to regional goal and objective):

- Provide some protection to nearshore shelf rockfish species, cabezon, and kelp greenling through the prohibition of commercial fishing. (Goal 2, Objective 3)
- Enhance recreational fishing near a population center (Cambria) by prohibiting commercial take in an area traditionally accessed primarily by recreational users. (Goal 3, Objective 1)
- Replicate habitats found in adjacent Cambria State Marine Reserve to allow comparison of an area which allows recreational fishing only with an area in which all take is prohibited. (Goal 3, Objective 2)
- Provide research benefits from existing subtidal and intertidal monitoring sites in this area and in the adjacent Cambria State Marine Reserve. (Goal 3, Objective 2)
- Enhance recreational fishing experience prohibiting commercial fishing. (Goal 3, Objective 4)
- Increase positive socioeconomic impacts for recreational fishing by establishing a state marine park in an area of traditional recreational use. (Goal 5, Objective 1)

Figure 15. Cambria State Marine Park and Cambria State Marine Reserve



Deleted: July 21, 2006 Page

Proposed MPA: Cambria State Marine Reserve

Area (sq. mi.): 2.32

Along-shore span (mi): 3.5

Depth range (ft): 0-99

Primary habitat types: sandy beach, rocky intertidal, surfgrass, shallow hard and soft bottom, kelp bed.

Proposed regulations: Take of all living marine resources is prohibited. **Note: alternatives are provided that allow for the take of kelp within this MPA. Final Commission decision will determine the regulations in this MPA.**

Boundaries: This area is bounded by the mean high tide line and straight lines connecting the following points in the order listed (Figure 15):

35° 32.85' N. lat. 121° 05.85' W. long.;

35° 32.85' N. lat. 121° 06.70' W. long.;

35° 30.50' N. lat. 121° 05.00' W. long.; and

35° 30.50' N. lat. 121° 03.40' W. long.

NOTE: An alternative boundary description is provided in the proposed regulations. Final Commission action will determine the boundaries of this MPA.

Examples of species likely to benefit: nearshore rockfish, squid, mussels, turban snails, limpets

Summary of Objectives: Provide for a high level of protection of a diverse area containing shallow hard and soft habitats, kelp beds, pinnacles, and associated fish and invertebrate species adjacent to an existing land based preserve and research facility.

Detailed Objectives (with reference to regional goal and objective):

- Protect area of particularly high species diversity including fish, invertebrates, kelp, marine birds, and marine mammals, including major rookeries containing California sea lion, northern elephant seal, harbor seal, Stellar sea lion, and northern fur seal. (Goal 1, Objective 1)
- Protect communities associated with a mosaic of habitat types, including sandy beach with diverse cobble size, rocky intertidal, surfgrass bed, kelp forest, pinnacles, and shallow hard and soft bottom, in close proximity to each other. (Goal 1, Objective 2)
- Protect natural age and size structure of species associated with sandy beach, rocky intertidal, surfgrass bed, kelp forest, pinnacles, and shallow hard and soft bottom habitat. (Goal 1, Objective 3)
- Protect natural trophic structure and food webs, including forage species such as juvenile rockfish, squid, and coastal pelagic finfish that serve as prey for other fish, marine birds, and marine mammals. (Goal 1, Objective 4)
- Protect larval sources and enhance reproductive capacity of nearshore fish and invertebrate species. (Goal 2, Objective 2)
- Provide protection to nearshore shelf rockfish species, cabezon, and kelp greenling through the prohibition of commercial and recreational fishing. (Goal 2, Objective 3)

Deleted: Steller

Deleted: July 21, 2006 Page

- Replicate within a state marine reserve the range of shallow habitats found at Point Sur and Point Buchon State Marine Reserves. (Goal 3, Objective 2)
- Provide research benefits from existing subtidal and intertidal monitoring sites in this area and by comparison with adjacent state marine park. (Goal 3, Objective 2)
- Include and replicate sandy beach, rocky intertidal, surfgrass bed, kelp forest, pinnacles, and shallow hard and soft bottom habitat. (Goal 4, Objective 2)

Deleted: Protect

Proposed MPA: Morro Bay State Marine Reserve

Area (sq. mi.): 0.3

Along-shore span (mi): 1.4

Depth range (ft): 0-10

Primary habitat types: coastal marsh, tidal flats, estuary.

Proposed regulations: No take

Boundaries: This area includes the area below mean high tide line within Morro Bay east of longitude 120° 50.340' W. (Figure 16):

Examples of species likely to benefit: surfperches, leopard shark, starry flounder, worms, pelicans, scoters.

Summary of Objectives: Provide for complete protection in a portion of one of the few estuarine areas of the central coast. This area is within an existing State Park lease where current Park rules prohibit take of living resources.

Deleted: Page Break
Figure 14. Cambria State Marine Reserve

<sp> ¶

¶

¶

¶

¶

¶

¶

¶

¶

¶

¶

¶

¶

¶

¶

¶

¶

¶

¶

¶

¶

¶

¶

¶

¶

¶

¶

¶

¶

¶

¶

¶

¶

¶

¶

¶

¶

¶

¶

¶

¶

¶

¶

¶

¶

¶

¶

¶

¶

¶

¶

¶

¶

¶

¶

¶

¶

¶

¶

¶

¶

¶

¶

¶

¶

¶

¶

¶

Cambria SMR ¶

Deleted: 15

Deleted: Page Break

Detailed Objectives (with reference to regional goal and objective):

- Protect estuarine area with high marine bird diversity. (Goal 1, Objective 1)
- Protect communities associated with area with diversity of estuarine habitats, including open channels and mud flats, in close proximity to each other. (Goal 1, Objective 2)
- Protect natural age, size structure, and genetic diversity of fish and invertebrate species, especially elasmobranchs and flatfishes, characteristic of largest estuarine system within the central coast. (Goal 1, Objective 3)
- Protect natural structure and food web of estuarine system, including invertebrate forage base for marine birds. (Goal 1, Objective 4)
- Help protect listed marine birds and southern sea otter by protecting feeding area. (Goal 2, Objective 1)
- Enhance reproductive capacity of invertebrate and fish estuarine species by prohibiting take in important nursery area. (Goal 2, Objective 2)
- Provide educational and interpretive resources by establishing a state marine reserve adjacent to a museum, a terrestrial state park, and within the Morro Bay Estuarine Reserve. (Goal 3, Objective 1)
- Include and replicate representative central coast estuarine habitat within a state marine reserve. (Goal 3, Objective 2)
- Include estuarine habitat within a state marine reserve. (Goal 4, Objective 1)

Deleted: Protect

Deleted: Protect


Deleted: July 21, 2006 Page

- Minimize negative socio-economic impacts by establishing a state marine reserve in an area that is already closed to fishing, and where non-consumptive values such as wildlife viewing are likely to be enhanced. (Goal 5, Objective 1)

Figure 16. Morro Bay East State Marine Reserve and Morro Bay State Marine Recreational Management Area with no-take portion of the SMRMA indicated.

Deleted: Page Break

Deleted: 15



Proposed MPA: Morro Bay State Marine Recreational Management Area

Area (sq. mi.): 3.01

Along-shore span (mi): 9.4

Depth range (ft): 0-22

Primary habitat types: sandy beach, coastal marsh, tidal flats, eelgrass beds, estuary.

Proposed regulations: Take of all living marine resources is prohibited except recreational take of finfish, permitted aquaculture of oysters, and receiving of finfish for bait purposes north of latitude 35° 19.700' N. Recreational hunting of waterfowl is permitted unless otherwise restricted by hunting regulations.

Deleted: and

Boundaries: This area includes the area below mean high tide within Morro Bay east of the Morro Bay entrance breakwater and west of longitude 120° 50.340' W. (Figure 16):

Deleted: 15

Deleted: July 21, 2006 Page

Examples of species likely to benefit: worms, pelicans, scoters, ghost shrimp, mud shrimp.

Deleted: surfperches, leopard shark, starry flounder,

Summary of Objectives: Provide increased protection for one of the few estuarine areas of the central coast while allowing for the traditional use of waterfowl hunting.

Detailed Objectives (with reference to regional goal and objective):

- Protect estuarine area with high marine bird diversity. (Goal 1, Objective 1)
- Protect invertebrate communities associated with area with diversity of estuarine habitats, including open channels and mud flats, in close proximity to each other. (Goal 1, Objective 2)
- Protect natural age, size structure, and genetic diversity of invertebrate species characteristic of largest estuarine system within the central coast. (Goal 1, Objective 3)
- Protect natural structure and food web of estuarine system in a portion of the MMA, including invertebrate forage base for marine birds. (Goal 1, Objective 4)
- Help protect listed marine birds and southern sea otter by protecting feeding area. (Goal 2, Objective 1)
- Enhance reproductive capacity of invertebrate estuarine species by prohibiting take in important estuarine area. (Goal 2, Objective 2)
- Provide educational and interpretive resources by establishing a state marine recreational management area with full protection of marine invertebrate and algae species adjacent to a museum, a terrestrial state park, and within the Morro Bay Estuarine Reserve. (Goal 3, Objective 1)
- Include with estuarine habitat within a state marine recreational management area. (Goal 4, Objective 1)
- Minimize negative socio-economic impacts by establishing a state marine recreational management area with a no-take component in a location that has experienced relatively little fishing effort but has been a traditional waterfowl hunting area. (Goal 5, Objective 1)

Deleted: fish and

Deleted: , especially elasmobranchs and flatfishes,

Deleted: and fish

Deleted: nursery

Deleted: fish,

Deleted: ,

Deleted: Protect

Proposed MPA: Point Buchon State Marine Reserve

Area (sq. mi.): 6.66

Along-shore span (mi): 2.9

Depth range (ft): 0-208

Primary habitat types: sandy beach, rocky intertidal, shallow hard and soft bottom, pinnacles, kelp bed.

Proposed regulations: No take.

Boundaries: This area is bounded by the mean high tide line and straight lines connecting the following points in the order listed (Figure 17):

Deleted: 16

35° 15.25' N. lat. 120° 54.00' W. long.;

35° 15.25' N. lat. 120° 56.00' W. long.;

35° 11.00' N. lat. 120° 52.40' W. long.; and

35° 13.30' N. lat. 120° 52.40' W. long.

NOTE: An alternative boundary description is provided in the proposed regulations.

Final Commission action will determine the boundaries of this MPA.

Deleted: July 21, 2006 Page

Examples of species likely to benefit: nearshore and shelf rockfishes, lingcod, cabezon, kelp greenling, surfperches, California halibut, squid, shearwaters, pelicans, southern sea otter.

Summary of Objectives: Provide for complete protection of a diverse area containing shallow hard and soft habitats, kelp beds, pinnacles, and associated fish and invertebrate species, while benefiting from additional protection due to an adjacent national security closure. This area is important to the formation of an ecologically sound MPA network component, by linking these habitats to similar habitats in other parts of the region.

Detailed Objectives (with reference to regional goal and objective):

- Protect area of particularly high species diversity including fish, invertebrates, kelp, marine birds, and marine mammals. (Goal 1, Objective 1)
- Protect communities associated with diverse habitats, including sandy beach, rocky intertidal, kelp forest, and shallow hard and soft bottom habitat, in close proximity to each other. (Goal 1, Objective 2)
- Protect natural age and size structure of species associated with sandy beach, rocky intertidal, kelp forest, and shallow hard and soft bottom habitat. (Goal 1, Objective 3)
- Protect natural trophic structure and food webs in area representative of shallow hard and soft bottom habitats south of Morro Bay. (Goal 1, Objective 4)
- Protect full range of ecosystem functions in an area between two upwelling zones. (Goal 1, Objective 5)
- Help protect populations of nearshore rockfish in an area that has traditionally received relatively high fishing effort. (Goal 2, Objective 1).
- Protect larval sources and enhance reproductive capacity of nearshore fish and invertebrate species. (Goal 2, Objective 2)
- Establish a state marine reserve which encompasses an existing Cooperative Research and Assessment of Nearshore Ecosystems (CRANE) monitoring site, and which includes baseline data collected for power plant impact monitoring. (Goal 3, Objective 1)
- Establish a state marine reserve adjacent to a newly expanded terrestrial state park which has high visitor rates, interpretive facilities, docent presence, and parking. (Goal 3, Objective 1)
- Replicate within a state marine reserve the range of habitats found at fished sites south of Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant. (Goal 3, Objective 2)
- Include pinnacle habitat within a state marine reserve. (Goal 4, Objective 1)
- Include and replicate sandy beach, rocky intertidal, kelp forest, pinnacles, and shallow hard and soft bottom habitat. (Goal 4, Objective 2)
- Establish a marine protected area complex (along with Point Buchon State Marine Conservation Area) that meets Master Plan Framework scientific guidelines for size. (Goal 5, Objective 3)

Deleted: Replicate with

Deleted: Protect

Deleted: Protect

Deleted: July 21, 2006 Page

Deleted: 16



Deleted: ¶

Deleted: *Onchorhynchus*

Deleted: 16

Deleted: and

Deleted: July 21, 2006 Page

Examples of species likely to benefit: nearshore and shelf rockfishes, lingcod, cabezon, California halibut, squid, shearwaters, pelicans.

Summary of Objectives: Provide for increased protection of a diverse area containing shallow hard and soft habitats, kelp beds, pinnacles, and associated fish and invertebrate species, while minimizing impact to the salmon fishery. This area is important to the formation of an ecologically sound MPA network component, by linking these habitats to similar habitats in other parts of the region.

Detailed Objectives (with reference to regional goal and objective):

- Protect larval sources and enhance reproductive capacity of benthic fishes, invertebrates. (Goal 2, Objective 2)
- Provide additional protection for benthic species and typical forage species (squid and pelagic finfish) while allowing fishing for salmon and albacore. (Goal 2, Objective 3)
- Replicate with a state marine conservation area the range of habitats found at fished sites south of Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant. (Goal 3, Objective 2)
- Minimize negative socio-economic impacts by incorporating a portion of the Rockfish Conservation Area (closed to groundfish take), and by allowing the harvest of salmon and albacore. (Goal 5, Objective 1)
- Establish a marine protected area complex (along with Point Buchon State Marine Reserve) that meets Master Plan Framework scientific guidelines for size. (Goal 5, Objective 3)

Proposed MPA: Vandenberg State Marine Reserve

Area (sq. mi.): 32.84

Along-shore span (mi): 14.3

Depth range (ft): 0-127

Primary habitat types: sandy beach, rocky intertidal, shallow hard and soft bottom, kelp bed.

Proposed regulations: No take.

Boundaries: This area is bounded by the mean high tide line and straight lines connecting the following points in the order listed (Figure 18):

34° 44.65' N. lat. 120° 37.75' W. long.;

34° 44.65' N. lat. 120° 40.00' W. long.;

34° 33.25' N. lat. 120° 40.00' W. long.; and

34° 33.25' N. lat. 120° 37.25' W. long.

Deleted: 17

NOTE: An alternative boundary description is provided in the proposed regulations.

Final Commission action will determine the boundaries of this MPA.

(A) Within the Vandenberg State Marine Reserve, no take of living marine resources is permitted except take incidental to the mission critical operations of the Vandenberg Air Force Base and approved commercial space launch operations approved by the Base Commander.

(B) Public Entry. Public entry into the Vandenberg State Marine Reserve may be restricted at the discretion of the Department to protect wildlife, aquatic life, or habitat or by the Commander of Vandenberg Air Force Base to protect base operations.

Deleted: Mission operations do not include take for recreational purposes by base personnel or others.

Deleted: department

Deleted: July 21, 2006 Page

(C) The Department shall enter into a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the Commander of Vandenberg Air Force Base for the management and administration of the Vandenberg State Marine Reserve. The MOU shall include all uses necessary and compatible with the Vandenberg Air Force Base's national defense mission and details on cooperative enforcement and monitoring.

Examples of species likely to benefit: nearshore and shelf rockfishes, lingcod, cabezon, kelp greenling, surfperches, California halibut, Dungeness crab, rock crab, squid, shearwaters, pelicans, southern sea otter.

Summary of Objectives: Provide for complete protection of a diverse area containing shallow hard and soft habitats, kelp beds, and associated fish and invertebrate, while benefiting from protection provided by an existing state marine reserve and restrictions on vessel traffic, including fishing vessels, due to the presence of Vandenberg Air Force Base. This area is important to the formation of an ecologically sound MPA network component, by linking these habitats to similar habitats in other parts of the region.


Detailed Objectives (with reference to regional goal and objective):

- Protect area with high marine bird, marine mammal, fish, and invertebrate species diversity and abundance. (Goal 1, Objective 1)
- Protect **communities associated with** area with unique oceanographic conditions in transition zone near a biogeographical regional boundary, including sandy beach, rocky intertidal, kelp forest, and hard and soft bottom habitat, and in close proximity to each other. (Goal 1, Objective 2)
- Protect natural age and size structure of Nearshore Fishery Management Plan species which occur within the central coast. (Goal 1: Objective 3)
- Protect trophic structure and food web in area representative of shallow habitats south of Morro Bay. (Goal 1, Objectives 4)
- Protect ecosystem structure and functions in representative shallow habitat in southern end of central coast. (Goal 1, Objective 5)
- Increase ecological benefits to an area containing a mosaic of shallow hard and soft bottom habitats through the expansion of an existing state marine reserve. (Goal 1, Objective 5)
- Help protect marine bird and marine mammal species of concern by protecting forage base adjacent to colonies and rookeries. (Goal 2, Objective 1)
- Protect larval sources and enhance reproductive capacity of benthic fishes, invertebrates, and coastal pelagic finfish. (Goal 2, Objective 2)
- Establish a state marine reserve which encompasses an existing PISCO monitoring site, a Multi-Agency Intertidal Network (MARINe) monitoring site, and a Point Reyes Bird Observatory (PRBO) study site. (Goal 3, Objective 1)
- Replicate with a state marine reserve the same range of habitats found at fished sites at Point Sal. (Goal 3, Objective 2)
- **Include** and replicate within a state marine reserve sandy beach, rocky intertidal, and shallow hard and soft bottom habitats. (Goal 4, Objective 2)
- Establish a state marine reserve that meets preferred Master Plan Framework scientific guidelines for size. (Goal 5, Objective 3)

Deleted: Protect

Deleted: July 21, 2006 Page

Figure 18. Vandenberg State Marine Reserve.



Deleted: 17

Deleted: ¶

Deleted: An overarching structure for baseline data collection programs gives

Deleted: appropriate framework from which to approach creation of the

Deleted: program. The overarching structure, as shown in Figure 18 below, has five tiers:¶

¶ The top tier includes the five goals

Deleted: MLPA that relate to baseline

Deleted: collection as well as other MPA goals not included in

Deleted: MLPA that should be addressed to support adaptive management

Deleted: The second tier breaks

Deleted: goals of the MLPA and other MPA goals into distinct components and converts them into questions¶

<#>The third tier breaks these goal-based questions into more focused, answerable questions¶

<#>The fourth tier outlines baseline data collection programs that will answer the focused, answerable questions¶

The fifth tier outlines the data required for each

Deleted: data collection program¶

¶ Figure 18. Description of Structural Tiers¶

<sp>¶

¶ Description of Baseline Monitoring Program¶

Placeholder to describe data needs and activities to acquire those data¶

¶

This document sets forth a set of programs for collecting data on baseline

Deleted: concurrent with implementation of the Central Coast network of state MPAs. These baseline indicators comprise a core set of biological and socioeconomic variables which

Deleted: July 21, 2006 Page

8.4.2. General Activities and Locations

Baseline Scientific Monitoring and Research plan

Monitoring to support adaptive management of MPA networks or network components (a) begins with understanding of baseline conditions and (b) proceeds over time to monitor changes expected to result from the establishment of Marine Protected areas. Prior to full implementation, or concurrent with implementation of new or expanded MPAs, baseline data are needed to help guide future decisions on the effectiveness of the network component in meeting the goals of the MLPA and specific objectives of individual MPAs. These baseline indicators comprise a core set of biological and socioeconomic variables that will be an integral component of the MPAs' long term monitoring and where some urgency exists to commence data collection activities. Thus, these baseline indicators represent some, but not all, of the data categories needed for monitoring the MPA network.

Specifically, the baseline indicators fulfill the following three criteria.

1. Each will be useful for evaluating performance relative to the statewide, Central Coast regional, and MLPA goals and the individual MPA-specific objectives;
2. Each is likely to be highly sensitive to the changed management status of the MPAs following designation: Therefore, priority should be given to collecting data on these indicators as soon as possible relative to implementation of the MPAs; and
3. Practical scientifically-valid methods already exist for gathering data on each indicator.

Deleted: goals and

Selection of these indicators was informed by consideration of the Central Coast regional and MPA specific goals and objectives and the broader set of long-term monitoring needs identified in Table 6. Following are lists of potential bio-physical and human use data collection programs ranked in priority for baseline data needs. Each includes estimates for the first year costs for the Central Coast project area. These costs would form the basis of estimates for long-term costs for future study regions, but should not be considered equivalent to annual costs for a long term monitoring plan and associated costs to support adaptive management. The final data collection programs will depend upon both the final set of MPAs selected and implementation dates.

Deleted: -----Page Break-----
Long-term and ongoing Monitoring
 ¶ Similar to the baseline program, ongoing monitoring is directed by the specific objectives of the individual MPAs within the regional network component as well as the overarching objectives of the regional component as a whole and those of the MLPA. For each MPA, specific monitoring activities linked to the MPA's objectives are provided here along with the specific indicators being monitored. The frequency of monitoring is intended to provide sufficient data to determine effectiveness of the regional component as a whole as well as the individual MPA's contribution to the overall effectiveness. Final determinations on effectiveness of the region's network component will be made based upon the network component as a whole, though adaptive management may occur at the scale of individual MPAs, groups of MPAs, or the entire regional network component. Table 5 lists each MPA, the goals of the MLPA it is intended to meet, the MPA specific objectives, the overarching questions necessary to determine if the objectives have been met, and the general monitoring activities and frequency of monitoring. Following the table is a summary of the monitoring plan necessary to conduct the activities listed in Table 5.¶

Potential Bio-Physical Baseline Data Collection Programs

Indicator: Distribution, diversity, relative abundance, and sizes of species and habitat attributes for deep canyons, coral, and rocky reef habitats.

Priority: High

Description: This program would use submersible submarine surveys to study deepwater species and habitats inside and outside of designated MPAs in the Central Coast. Surveys would focus on approximately 60-80 species of fish and 20-30 species of invertebrates at depths ranging from 50-300 meters at approximately 34 sites (17 MPAs) and would require approximately one sea day per site.

Relation to Existing Programs: These data are not being collected by existing programs.

Estimated Cost: \$1,600,000

Indicator: Distribution, diversity, relative abundance, and sizes of species and habitat attributes for kelp forest habitats.

Priority: High

Description: This program would use SCUBA surveys to study kelp forest species and habitats inside and outside of designated MPAs in the Central Coast. Surveys would focus on approximately 25 species of fish, 30 species of invertebrates, and 10 species of algae at approximately 30 sites (15 MPAs).

Relation to Existing Programs: This program would compliment existing monitoring programs.

Estimated Cost: \$400,000

Indicator Data: Distribution, diversity, relative abundance, and sizes of species and habitat attributes for kelp forest habitats.

Priority: High

Description: This program use fishing gear surveys to study kelp forest species inside and outside of designated MPAs with kelp forest habitats in the Central Coast. Surveys would focus on 25 species of fish at approximately 30 sites (15 MPAs) and would require multiple days of surveys at each location.

Deleted: July 21, 2006 Page

Relation to Existing Programs: These data are not being collected by existing programs.
Estimated Cost: \$250,000

Indicator Data: Distribution, diversity, relative abundance, and sizes of species and habitat attributes for midwater and deep soft bottom habitats.

Priority: Medium

Description: This program would use sled or ROV surveys to study soft bottom species and habitats inside and outside of designated MPAs in the Central Coast. Surveys would focus on fish at approximately 10 sites (5 MPAs based).

Relation to Existing Programs: These data are not being collected by existing programs.

Estimated Cost: \$400,000

Indicator Data: Distribution, diversity, relative abundance, and sizes of species and habitat attributes for rocky intertidal habitats.

Priority: Medium

Description: This program would use visual surveys to study rocky intertidal species and habitats inside and outside of designated MPAs in the Central Coast. Surveys would focus on algae and invertebrates at approximately 28 sites (14 MPAs).

Relation to Existing Programs: This program would compliment existing monitoring programs.

Estimated Cost: \$200,000

Indicator Data: Distribution, species composition, abundance (density), group size, and behaviors or marine mammal and bird populations

Priority: Medium

Description: This program would use shipboard surveys and follow randomly placed transect lines inside and adjacent to designated MPAs in the Central Coast. Surveys would gather information of a wide variety of species, with special attention to Marbled Murrelets, Common Murre, Sooty Shearwaters, Cassin's Auklet, Harbor seals, and Harbor porpoise. Surveys would focus on 10 MPAs in the network where marine birds and mammals were listed as a priority in MPA-specific objectives.

Relation to Existing Programs: This program would compliment existing monitoring programs.

Estimated Cost: \$200,000

Indicator Data: Distribution, diversity, relative abundance, and sizes of species and habitat attributes for estuarine habitats

Priority: Low

Description: This program would study estuarine species and habitats at designated MPAs in the Central Coast (2 MPAs).

Relation to Existing Programs: Programs to gather these data may already exist at proposed MPAs in the Central Coast. Such programs need to be researched.

Estimated Cost: Up to \$500,000 depending on existing programs.

Indicator Data: Distribution, diversity, relative abundance, and sizes of species and habitat attributes for sandy beach habitats

Priority: Low

Deleted: July 21, 2006 Page

Description: This program would use tag and recapture programs and visual and SCUBA surveys to study sandy beach species and habitats in less than 15 meter depths inside and outside of designated MPAs in the Central Coast. Surveys would focus on fish, invertebrates, and birds at all MPAs with sandy beach habitats.

Relation to Existing Programs: These data are not being collected by existing programs.

Estimated Cost: \$200,000

Potential Human-Use Baseline Data Collection Programs

Indicator Data: Fine-scale spatial data on effort and harvest of commercial consumptive users.

Priority: High

Description: This program would use transponders on a sample of the commercial fishing fleet in order to gather information on the effort and harvest of these users. This program would also develop a protocol to be used with the transponder information.

Relation to Existing Programs: These data would complement the logbook information that is collected for the commercial squid and spot prawn fisheries.

Estimated Cost: \$280,000

Indicator Data: CRFS data, intercept surveys, logbook data for recreational consumptive users (Phase 1)

Priority: High

Description: Catch and fishing effort data for recreational consumptive users (including commercial passenger fishing vessels) are currently being collected from a variety of sources. This program will assimilate, compile, and analyze this existing information to make it more usable in assessing MPAs in the Central Coast Study Region, including the development of GIS tools.

Relation to Existing Programs: These data are already being collected, but the resulting information has not been synthesized.

Estimated Cost: \$100,000

Indicator Data: CRFS data, intercept surveys, logbook data for recreational consumptive users (Phase 2)

Priority: High

Description: Catch and fishing effort data for recreational consumptive users (including commercial passenger fishing vessels) are currently being collected from a variety of sources. This program will expand the collection of these data in order to better understand assess MPAs in the Central Coast Study Region

Relation to Existing Programs: These data are already being collected, but collection programs need to be expanded.

Estimated Cost: \$300,000

Indicator Data: Non-consumptive effort and welfare data (primary group).

Priority: High

Description: This program would measure effort and welfare (number of trips, number of dives, etc.) of non-consumptive SCUBA divers across time and space. Zip code information (travel cost) and expenditure patterns data would also be collected. Sampling methods might include postcard mail-back surveys to identify the user populations, internet surveys for more

Deleted: July 21, 2006 Page

in-depth info and intercept surveys for fine scale spatial data including looking at charts/maps and creating shapefiles to determine where use occurs.

Relation to Existing Programs: These data are not being collected by existing programs.

Estimated Cost: \$400,000

Indicator Data: Cost and earnings data for commercial consumptive users.

Priority: Medium

Description: This program would collect data on cost and earnings of commercial fishermen before and after MPA implementation.

Relation to Existing Programs: These data are not being collected by existing programs.

Estimated Cost: \$300,000

Indicator Data: Stated importance data for commercial consumptive users.

Priority: Medium

Description: This program would expand upon the data collected by Ecotrust by conducting stated importance surveys on a regular short-term basis (e.g. annually) with commercial fishermen. This kind of information might be used to address gaps in other data on commercial consumptive users.

Relation to Existing Programs: This program would expand upon the past Ecotrust study.

Estimated Cost: \$250,000-\$300,000

Indicator Data: Stated preference data for recreational consumptive users

Priority: Medium

Description: Additional data would be collected to measure the knowledge, attitudes, and perceptions (beyond what is collected in CRFS surveys) of recreational consumptive users in relation to MPAs by means of representative sampling using surveys, group sessions, data mining, and other methods. Phone surveys might be used for license-holders. Intercept surveys would be necessary to collect data on users fishing from man-made structures.

Relation to Existing Programs: These data are not being collected by existing programs.

Estimated Cost: \$250,000-\$300,000

Indicator Data: Cost and earnings data for recreational consumptive use businesses

Priority: Medium

Description: These data are necessary to estimate impact of MPAs on employment, business profitability, and flow of pertinent tax revenues.

Relation to Existing Programs: These data have not been collected in a broad, uniform effort

Estimated Cost: \$100,000-\$200,000

Indicator Data: Non-consumptive effort and welfare data (secondary group).

Priority: Medium

Description: This program would measure effort and welfare of non-consumptive users for a "secondary" group, including kayakers, wildlife viewers (tidepool, bird, and whale) and unplanned ancillary activities. These users are less directly affected by MPAs than the "primary" group described above, though they may be greater in number.

Relation to Existing Programs: These data are not being collected by existing programs.

Estimated Cost: \$200,000

Indicator Data: Non-consumptive user knowledge, attitudes, and perceptions.

Deleted: July 21, 2006 Page

Priority: Medium

Description: This program would gather data on the knowledge, attitudes, and perceptions of non-consumptive users across time, space, and user-group. Information would be gathered for core non-consumptive user groups including divers, kayakers, and wildlife viewers (whale, bird, tidepool). Data would be gathered by means of surveys, group sessions, data mining, and other methods.

Relation to Existing Programs: These data are not being collected by existing programs.

Estimated Cost: \$100,000 (Estimated cost dependent on combination with effort and welfare data collection programs)

Long-term and ongoing Monitoring

As stated above in Section 6, the purpose of monitoring is to measure performance relative to stated goals and objectives and provide information for adaptive management. The Marine Life Protection Act (MLPA) calls for monitoring of selected areas to assist with adaptive management of the MPA network. Similar to the baseline program, ongoing monitoring is directed by the specific objectives of the individual MPAs (see individual MPA and MMA descriptions in section 8.4.1 above) within the regional network component as well as the overarching objectives of the regional component as a whole (see regional goals and objectives in section 8.4.1 above) and those of the MLPA. Given the anticipated size of the statewide network as well as network components, monitoring all MPAs for all goals and objectives is not feasible. Rather, where MPAs share goals and/or objectives, a representative subset of MPAs will be monitored to determine performance. It is expected that most objectives for each MPA will be evaluated.

The regional goals are: Goal 1) to protect the natural diversity and abundance of marine life, and the structure, function, and integrity of marine ecosystems; Goal 2) to help sustain, conserve, and protect marine life populations, including those of economic value, and rebuild those that are depleted; Goal 3) improve recreational, educational, and study opportunities provided by marine ecosystems that are subject to minimal human disturbances and manage these uses in a manner consistent with protecting biodiversity; Goal 4) to protect marine natural heritage, including protection of representative and unique marine life habitats in central California waters, for their intrinsic value; Goal 5) ensure that central California's MPAs have clearly defined objectives, effective management measures, and adequate enforcement, and are based on sound scientific guidelines; and Goal 6) to ensure that the central coast's MPAs are designed and managed, to the extent possible, as a component of a statewide network (Section 8.4.1). Monitoring will be necessary and evaluated by performance indicators for specific objectives for each goal. Monitoring will encompass biophysical, socioeconomic, management, and enforcement parameters.

The long term monitoring program will consist of existing monitoring programs and collaborations. Ongoing monitoring programs that meet the necessary parameters will be utilized and expanded upon where necessary. Collaborations will also be sought to support additional monitoring efforts and where no ongoing monitoring is occurring. Ongoing monitoring efforts are discussed in greater detail below in the section Long Term Monitoring. Potential collaborations are identified under the monitoring plan and in the section Collaborations and Potential Partnerships. A request for proposals process will be used to support monitoring programs and develop specific protocol.

Deleted: July 21, 2006 Page

Biophysical Monitoring

Monitoring ecosystem attributes

A functioning ecosystem is one that maintains species diversity and abundance, trophic structure, and can contain multiple habitats. Further, ecosystem functions are those natural processes that provide a set of conditions to allow for the above factors to occur and be maintained. These processes are driven by both biological and physical factors which combine in specific areas, e.g. areas of upwelling or biogeographic transition zones.

Regional goal 1 is essentially the protection of ecosystems and ecosystem attributes. The primary objectives within goal 1 are to protect and maintain ecosystem structure and function; protect and maintain areas of high species diversity and abundance; protect and maintain trophic structure; protect marine communities associated with a diversity of habitats; and the natural size and age structure and genetic diversity of populations. While the objectives are intended to provide protection to ecosystems, ecosystems are not bounded in small areas. An MPA provides protection by means of regulations to a specific area containing part of the ecosystem. The regulations primarily limit fishing, but may restrict other activities that have the potential to damage resources. It is assumed that human activities, particularly fishing, have reduced or eliminated populations of some species in some areas, changed feeding and other ecological relationships, and/or resulted in alterations in ecosystem attributes. With the restriction of deleterious activities, ecosystem attributes should recover within the protected area.

The objectives in Goal 1 will be achieved through the protection of various ecozones and habitats represented across all MPAs. As an example, Año Nuevo SMR and Point Sur SMR contain headlands that create a lee, while upwelling zones have been identified in the Big Creek SMR and Point Buchon SMR, and areas of high species diversity will be protected with the Año Nuevo SMR, Piedras Blancas SMR, Cambria SMR, Point Buchon SMR, and Vandenberg SMR. Some MPAs have been identified as containing specific habitats or species. For example, estuarine habitats will be protected in the Elkhorn Slough SMR and SMP or the Morro Bay SMRMA and SMR while many nearshore fishery management plan species are found in the Greyhound Rock SMCA. Similarly, certain MPAs have been identified to protect the trophic structure of seabirds, marine mammals, or higher trophic level fish.

Performance indicators will provide a unit to compare against reference areas outside the MPAs. Indicators for ecosystem structure and function include species composition, species diversity and number of species with increased recruitment. The expectation is that a full complement of species is present and that abundances are within the range of normal variability. If that is the case, then competition between species, predator/prey relationships and other functional attributes should be normal as well. If the MPA serves as a nursery, initial juvenile recruitment should be enhanced relative to reference areas outside MPAs. The number of species with enhanced recruitment measures the magnitude of the nursery function across species. Species composition and diversity can be calculated from measurements of the number of species, their relative abundance, and evenness within a sample.

Deleted: July 21, 2006 Page

Population Monitoring

Regional goal 2 provides protection for populations and the rebuilding of depleted populations. Objectives that are necessary in protecting populations and population dynamics (goal 2) are to enhance reproductive capacity and protect larval sources through the retention of large, mature individuals, and to protect particular species of interest while allowing some harvest of others. An additional objective within goal 2 is the rebuilding of depleted species and protection of the habitats upon which they rely. As noted for goal 1 these objectives will be met through various MPAs.

Performance indicators for population monitoring include identifying the proportion of the regional population within MPAs, population size, recruitment and mortality, number of juveniles, number of reproductive females, and the number of larvae or offspring per adult.

Protection of larval sources and enhanced reproductive capacity goes hand-in-hand with protection of the population. With reduced mortality, it is expected that the number and size of individuals within MPAs will increase. With increasing numbers of large females, reproductive capacity should increase (be enhanced). If a MPA acts as a nursery site, there should be more juveniles inside the MPA than in outside reference areas. The increase in recruitment could result from self-recruitment (larvae settling back to the populations from which they were spawned) or from recruitment from outside areas. Similarly, if a MPA acts as a spawning site, there should be increased reproductive output from that MPA.

The amount of protection afforded a population by MPAs depends on the proportion of the population within MPAs and the residence time of that proportion. Population size can be calculated from measurements of density and the amount of available habitat. Estimating the proportion of the regional population within MPAs requires an estimate of the total abundance of the population within the region and residence time within MPAs. When most of the population lives within MPAs and the species is relatively sedentary, protection will be high. When the species is broadly distributed and/or mobile, protection will be lower. MPAs may provide protection for a critical life stage. In this case, protection may be high even when a majority of the population is not protected.

The contribution of the MPAs to the restoration of overfished species can, in part, be measured by the increase in abundance within MPAs compared to areas outside of MPAs. Presumably, enhanced reproduction will also increase abundance of depleted species outside of MPAs. However, at present, it is difficult to follow the movement of larvae (or other propagules) produced in MPAs, although new genetic and other approaches can provide measures of larval dispersal, demographic connectivity between populations, and self-recruitment. It is also difficult to determine if settling larvae survive and grow to reproductive size. The potential contribution of MPAs to restoration of depleted populations can be calculated, but measuring the realized potential will require further research and development.

For seabirds and mammals, the primary indicator is the number of offspring per adult, which can be measured by monitoring breeding activity.

Deleted: July 21, 2006 Page

Habitat Monitoring

Regional goal 4 is the protection of habitats. Objectives pertaining to the protection of habitats are the inclusion and replication of a diversity of habitats within the MPA network and network components, inclusion of a diversity of habitats within individual MPAs, and the protection of specific habitats. Additionally, goal 4 specifically calls for the inclusion of estuaries, heads of submarine canyons, and pinnacles. These objectives were used in designing network components and will be realized with implementation of the MPAs.

The indicators for habitat monitoring are the presence or absence of a particular habitat and the amount of habitat in each habitat category. While this indicator only measures quantity, indicators of quality are not currently available. Measuring habitat will require calculating habitat areas from existing fine-scale habitat maps, kelp bed aerial survey photos, and mapping previously unmapped hard and soft bottom substrates, eelgrass and surfgrass beds. It will also require using satellite imagery to map the location of upwelling plumes near Point Sur and the location of the transition zone near Point Conception.

Determining if the objectives are met will require measuring the amount of each habitat in the MPAs. Measurements are needed over time because anthropogenic activities can change habitats. The location of oceanographic features may also change over time.

Socioeconomic Monitoring

Socioeconomic information is needed to evaluate regional Goal 3 which is to improve recreational, educational, and study opportunities provided by marine ecosystems that are subject to minimal human disturbances, and to manage these uses in a manner consistent with protecting biodiversity. Evaluating this goal will require monitoring human activities, the effect of the activities on the ecosystem, and the effectiveness of management.

Primary indicators for socioeconomic monitoring include changes in non-consumptive recreational, commercial, and educational and research activities. Indicators for recreation include the number of recreational trips by activity (scuba diving, boating and kayaking, wildlife viewing, tidepooling), and recreational participant satisfaction. Indicators for education are the number of educational trips and the number of classroom study units related to central coast MPAs. Indicators for research are the number of research projects in the MPAs and the number of citations of publications resulting from projects in MPAs.

To determine the social and economic ramifications for users and associated communities there is a particular need to measure changes in recreational and commercial fishing and non-consumptive uses, not only as part of the evaluation of social and economic impacts, but also to determine if displacement of fishing activity is increasing biological impacts outside of MPAs.

Management and Enforcement Monitoring

Information related to management and enforcement is needed for the evaluation of regional Goal 5 which is to ensure that central California's MPAs have clearly defined objectives, effective management measures, and adequate enforcement, and are based on sound

Deleted: July 21, 2006 Page

scientific guidelines; and Goal 6 which is to ensure that the central coast's MPAs are designed and managed, to the extent possible, as a component of a statewide network. Specific regional objectives under goal 5 are basically to minimize negative socioeconomic impacts, develop objectives, a long term monitoring plan, and evaluation process, and use scientific guidelines in the Master Plan Framework. Regional objectives under goal 6 include developing a process for regional review and evaluation including stakeholder involvement, and developing a mechanism to coordinate future stakeholder groups to ensure the statewide network meets the goals of the MLPA.

Indicators for management and enforcement monitoring are discussed below in the long-term monitoring plan summary.

Network Monitoring

Regional goals providing guidance on network design are: Goal 5) to ensure that central California's MPAs have clearly defined objectives, effective management measures, and adequate enforcement, and are based on sound scientific guidelines; and Goal 6) to ensure that the central coast's MPAs are designed and managed, to the extent possible, as a component of a statewide network.

The MLPA Science Advisory Team (SAT) developed guidelines as a framework for the design process with the intention of producing a network of MPAs that met the goals and objectives of the MLPA. MPA-specific objectives for network design provide directions for: 1) siting MPAs (e.g., site a MPA adjacent to a terrestrial park/reserve); 2) meeting network criteria for size, shoreline extent, etc.; 3) increasing socioeconomic benefits; 4) minimization of negative socioeconomic impacts; 5) provision for some types of fishing and/or harvest; and 6) provision for research and education. It should be noted that some of the MPA objectives will not require monitoring but will be met upon adoption. These objectives are listed in Table 5 below. Other MPA objectives related to the protection of the physical habitat types will not require monitoring but only an initial verification of the presence of those habitats, as significant long-term changes to basic substrate types are not expected to occur within MPAs or the central coast region in general. For the remainder of the MPA objectives, specific monitoring activities linked to them are provided below with the specific indicators to be monitored. The sampling design and frequency of monitoring will incorporate considerations of spatial and temporal variation in ecological and human-related patterns and processes. In any case, sampling frequency will vary from annually to every five years depending on the information being gathered and spatial location (Table 6).

Evaluating performance of the network or network components requires knowledge of connectivity. Biological connectivity of the network and network components depends on the movement of adults and larvae or other propagules (e.g., spores) between individual MPAs. As discussed above, adults and juveniles gain protection by residence within an MPA. The residence may be within a single MPA or within multiple MPAs. With larvae, the expectation is that some larvae produced in an MPA will settle and grow within another MPA. Of course, larvae settling in any one area are likely to come from multiple sources. Larvae settling in an MPA may come from areas outside of MPAs and larvae produced in an MPA may settle in or outside MPAs. To measure connectivity, the source of the settling larvae must be known.

Deleted: July 21, 2006 Page

With the current state of knowledge, it is possible to measure adult and juvenile movement with acoustic tags and/or mark and recapture studies. Although measuring larval production and settlement in the field is possible, tracking larval dispersal and determining larval sources is difficult. However, new genetic and other approaches can provide measures of larval dispersal, demographic connectivity between populations, and self-recruitment (larvae settling back to the populations from which they were spawned). Larval dispersal can also be modeled. With additional research, it may be possible to improve methods for tracking larvae or develop other approaches for measuring network properties. The biophysical monitoring program will provide useful information on, among other things, adult movement and the change in the density, size structure and larval production of populations over time. Research is needed to provide guidance on how to use the data to measure connectivity.

Final determinations on effectiveness of the region's network component will be made based upon the network component as a whole, though adaptive management may occur at the scale of individual MPAs, groups of MPAs, or the entire regional network component. Table 6 lists the goals of the MLPA the various MPAs expected to help achieve those goals, the general objectives, the overarching questions necessary to determine if the objectives have been met, and the general monitoring activities. Following the table is a summary of the monitoring plan necessary to conduct the activities listed.

Deleted: July 21, 2006 Page

Table 5. Central coast MPA objectives that will be met (or mostly met) by adoption and implementation of the MPA. For full objectives see section 8.4.1 above.

MLPA Goal By Number	MPAs	General Objective	Overarching Question	Monitoring Activity
2	Soquel Canyon SMCA Portuguese Ledge SMCA Point Lobos SMCA Point Buchon SMCA	Protect rockfishes and other components of a deep benthic community, while allowing some harvest	Is take of rockfish prohibited while other harvest is allowed?	Completed by adoption of MPA; will require monitoring of use to confirm
2	Elkhorn Slough SMP	Provide for traditional recreational consumptive and nonconsumptive uses while offering some protection due to the prohibition of commercial fishing.	Does the MPA allow for recreational and nonconsumptive uses and prohibit commercial ones?	Completed by adoption of MPA; will require monitoring of use to confirm
2	Carmel Bay SMCA	Allow continued recreational harvest of finfish and commercial harvest of kelp by hand in an area of historic recreational use value near Monterey harbor while protecting invertebrates.	Does the MPA allow continued uses and prohibit take of invertebrates?	Completed by adoption of MPA; will require monitoring of use to confirm
3	Elkhorn Slough SMR Soquel Canyon SMCA Portuguese Ledge SMCA Ed Ricketts SMCA Lovers Point SMR Pacific Grove Marine Gardens SMCA Carmel Bay SMCA Point Lobos SMR Point Lobos SMCA Big Creek SMCA Big Creek SMR Cambria SMR Morro Bay SMRMA Morro Bay SMR Point Buchon SMR Vandenberg SMR	Provide increased research, education and study opportunities	Is MPA adjacent or near to research facilities or sites and do research and education activities increase over time?	Partially completed by adoption of MPA, track research and education activities.
3	Big Creek SMCA Big Creek SMR	Provide opportunities afforded by a nearby terrestrial reserve...to link classroom curricula.	Does MPA provide opportunity to link to classroom curricula?	Completed by adoption of MPA; will require monitoring of use to confirm
3	Big Creek SMCA Big Creek SMR	Provide opportunities for collaborative research projects involving commercial fishermen, including a possible study on the impact of salmon fishing.	Does MPA provide opportunities for collaborative research?	Completed by adoption of MPA; will require monitoring of use to confirm

Deleted: monitoring activities ... [10]

Deleted: MPA / Objective

Deleted: Overarching Question

Deleted: Monitoring Activity

Deleted: Frequency

Deleted: Año Nuevo SMR ... [11]

Deleted: Does species richn ... [12]

Deleted: Is the habitat prese ... [13]

Deleted: Protect natural size ... [14]

Deleted: Is the food web inte ... [15]

Deleted: Is the proportion of ... [16]

Deleted: Measure community ... [17]

Deleted: Map trophic relation ... [18]

Deleted: Every third to fifth year

Deleted: Protect natural trop ... [19]

Deleted: Annual to every other year

Deleted: 1

Deleted: Use community stru ... [20]

Deleted: Every third to fifth year

Deleted: Protect range of ec ... [21]

Deleted: 1

Deleted: Monitor habitat pres ... [22]

Deleted: Upon implementatio ... [23]

Deleted: 1

Deleted: Protect area of high ... [24]

Deleted: 1

Deleted: Protect diverse inte ... [25]

Deleted: Measure size range ... [26]

Deleted: Do focal species ins ... [27]

Deleted: Annual to every other year

Deleted: 1

Deleted: July 21, 2006 Page

3	Ed Ricketts SMCA Pacific Grove Marine Gardens SMCA	Promote opportunity for use of volunteer scuba divers in research and monitoring projects by establishing a state marine conservation area in a location heavily used by scuba divers where volunteer monitoring ...already takes place.	Is the MPA in an area where volunteer monitoring takes place?	Completed by adoption of MPA; will require monitoring of use to confirm	Deleted: Is foraging behavior ... [28] Deleted: Protect important for ... [29] Deleted: Use visual surveys ... [30] Deleted: 2 Deleted: Do reserves retain ... [31] Deleted: Protect larval source ... [32] Deleted: Measure size range ... [33] Deleted: 2 Deleted: Annual to every other year Deleted: Is MPA...State Park ... [34] Deleted: Once Deleted: Site a marine prote ... [35] Deleted: Upon implementatio ... [36] Deleted: Protect sandy and ... [37] Deleted: Is the habitat preser ... [38] Deleted: 4 Deleted: Monitor habitat pres ... [39] Deleted: Greyhound Rock S ... [40] Deleted: Protect area of high ... [41] Deleted: Do focal species ins ... [42] Deleted: Is foraging behavior ... [43] Deleted: Use visual surveys ... [44] Deleted: Protect important for ... [45] Deleted: 2 Deleted: Prior to implementa ... [46] Deleted: Does species richn ... [47] Deleted: Measure communit ... [48] Deleted: Measure size range ... [49] Deleted: 1 Deleted: Annual to every other year Deleted: 1 Deleted: Annual to every other year Deleted: Protect natural size ... [50] Deleted: July 21, 2006 Page
3	Pacific Grove Marine Gardens SMCA Carmel Bay SMCA	Maintain an existing state marine conservation area located near a population center that is accessible for recreational opportunities, both consumptive and non-consumptive.	Is the MPA near the population center and accessible to recreational opportunities?	Completed by adoption of MPA	
3	Carmel Bay SMCA	Allow for the comparison of a recreational fishing area adjacent to a no-take area.	Does the MPA allow for take/no-take comparison?	Completed by adoption of MPA	
3	Año Nuevo SMR Point Lobos SMR Point Sur SMR Pt. Buchon SMR	Site a marine protected area adjacent to a terrestrial state park or state reserve ...	Is MPA adjacent to a State Park or Reserve?	Año Nuevo State Reserve, Point Lobos State Reserve, Point Sur State Historic Park, and Montana de Oro Completed by adoption of MPA	
5	Point Lobos SMR Point Lobos SMCA Big Creek SMCA Big Creek SMR Point Buchon SMR Point Buchon SMCA	Establish marine protected area complexes that meet Master Plan Framework scientific guidelines for minimum size	Does complex meet minimum guidelines?	Completed by adoption of MPA	
5	Soquel Canyon SMCA Portuguese Ledge SMCA Point Sur SMR Point Sur SMCA Piedras Blancas SMR Piedras Blancas SMCA Vandenberg SMR	Establish marine protected areas or complexes that meet Master Plan Framework scientific guidelines regarding preferred size.	Does the MPA meet the preferred size guidelines?	Completed by adoption of MPA	
5	Ed Ricketts SMCA	Minimize negative socio-economic impacts by establishing a state marine conservation area which allows recreational fishing and hand harvest of kelp by local aquaculturists, while affording protection to invertebrates and prohibiting all other commercial take.	Does MPA allow recreational fishing and hand harvest of kelp and prohibit other take?	Completed by adoption of MPA	
5	Pacific Grove Marine Gardens SMCA	Allow continued recreational fishing in traditional use area and hand harvest of kelp close to abalone aquaculture facilities.	Are recreational fishing and kelp harvest allowed in the area?	Completed by adoption of MPA	

5	Morro Bay SMRMA	Minimize negative socio-economic impacts by establishing a state marine recreational management area in a location that has experienced relatively little fishing effort but has been a traditional waterfowl hunting area.	Does the area allow waterfowl hunting while prohibiting other take?	Completed by adoption of MPA	Deleted: Do reserves retain large, mature, fecund individuals of selected species and do recruitment rates of selected species change over time inside marine reserves versus areas outside?
5	Morro Bay SMR	Minimize negative socio-economic impacts by establishing a state marine reserve in a location that is already closed to fishing...	Is the area already closed to fishing?	Completed by adoption of MPA	Deleted: Measure size range, density, and makeup of focal species assemblage and relative recruitment rates of selected species inside and outside MPAs
Table 6. Central coast MPA monitoring activities based upon MLPA Goals and general individual MPA objectives. For full objectives see section 8.4.1 above.					
MLPA Goal By Number	MPAs	General Objective	Overarching Question	Potential Monitoring Activity and Frequency	
1	Año Nuevo SMR Greyhound Rock SMCA Soquel Canyon SMCA Portuguese Ledge SMCA Point Lobos SMR Point Sur SMR Point Sur SMCA Big Creek SMCA Big Creek SMR Piedras Blancas SMR Piedras Blancas SMCA Cambria SMR Morro Bay SMRMA Morro Bay SMR Point Buchon SMR Vandenberg SMR	Protect area of high species diversity...and maintain species diversity and abundance...	Do species richness and/or diversity stay the same or increase in MPAs relative to areas of similar habitat adjacent to and distant from MPAs?	Measure community structure and species composition including habitat forming species within and outside MPAs over time Monitoring frequency should occur annually to every other year, except Morro Bay SMRMA and Morro Bay SMR bird diversity should be monitored upon implementation and every 3 rd year thereafter	Deleted: Annual to every other year Deleted: 2 Deleted: Protect larval source and enhance reproductive capacity of invertebrate species ... and finfish species... Deleted: Elkhorn Slough St ... [51] Deleted: 1 Deleted: Protect area with diversity of estuarine habitats... Deleted: Protect natural age, size structure, and genetic diversity of fish and invertebrate species characteristic of one of largest estuarine systems within the q ... [52] Deleted: Upon implementati ... [53] Deleted: Protect estuarine ar ... [54] Deleted: Does MPA contain ... [55] Deleted: Monitor bird diversit ... [56] Deleted: Upon Deleted: third Deleted: Annual to Deleted: other Deleted: Monitor habitat pres ... [57] Deleted: Is the habitat prese ... [58] Deleted: Do focal species ins ... [59] Deleted: Measure size range ... [60] Deleted: July 21, 2006 Page
1	Año Nuevo SMR Soquel Canyon SMCA Portuguese Ledge SMCA Carmel Pinnacles SMR Point Lobos SMR Point Lobos SMCA Point Sur SMR Point Sur SMCA Big Creek SMCA Big Creek SMR Piedras Blancas SMR Piedras Blancas SMCA Cambria SMR Morro Bay SMRMA Morro Bay SMR Point Buchon SMR Vandenberg SMR	Protect marine communities associated with various diverse habitats	Is the habitat present and does it persist in a viable state within the MPA?	Monitor habitat presence, composition, and status over time Monitoring frequency should occur upon implementation and every 3 rd year thereafter.	

<u>MLPA Goal By Number</u>	<u>MPAs</u>	<u>General Objective</u>	<u>Overarching Question</u>	<u>Potential Monitoring Activity and Frequency</u>	
1	Año Nuevo SMR Greyhound Rock SMCA Elkhorn Slough SMR Elkhorn Slough SMP Point Lobos SMR Point Sur SMR Point Sur SMCA Big Creek SMCA Big Creek SMR Piedras Blancas SMR Piedras Blancas SMCA Cambria SMR Morro Bay SMRMA Morro Bay SMR Point Buchon SMR Vandenberg SMR	Protect natural size and age structure and genetic diversity of various marine species populations	Do focal species inside marine reserves increase in size, numbers, and biomass relative to areas of similar habitat adjacent to and distant from MPAs?	Measure size range, density, and makeup of focal species assemblages within, adjacent to and far from MPAs Monitoring frequency should occur annually to every other year	Deleted: 1 Deleted: Upon implementation and every third year thereafter Deleted: Protect estuarine area with high bird diversity. Deleted: Does MPA contain high bird diversity and is this diversity maintained? Deleted: Monitor bird diversity within and outside the area over time. Deleted: Protect natural structure and food web of estuarine system... Deleted: Every third to fifth year Deleted: Map trophic relationships then estimate biomass for different trophic levels and measure average weight of higher trophic level species where possible
1	Año Nuevo SMR Point Lobos SMR Point Sur SMR Point Sur SMCA Piedras Blancas SMR Piedras Blancas SMCA Cambria SMR Morro Bay SMRMA Morro Bay SMR Point Buchon SMR Vandenberg SMR	Protect natural trophic structure and food web including forage base ...for listed marine birds and marine mammals as well as higher trophic level fish...	Is the food web integrity greater within the MPA than outside: Do the abundance and size/age structure of key predator and prey species differ inside and outside MPAs in areas of comparable habitat?	Map trophic relationships then estimate biomass for different trophic levels and measure average weight of higher trophic level species where possible Monitoring frequency should occur every 3rd-5th year	Deleted: Is the food web inte ... [61] Deleted: Help protect listed r ... [62] Deleted: Prior to implementa ... [63] Deleted: Use visual surveys ... [64] Deleted: Are foraging, roosti ... [65]
1	Año Nuevo SMR Point Lobos SMR Big Creek SMR Point Buchon SMR Vandenberg SMR	Protect ecosystem structure and functions associated with various habitats	Is the proportion of area within which focal species are restored to or maintained at self replenishing levels greater within the MPA than in similar habitats outside?	Use community structure and focal species size range and density data to model ability to replenish Monitoring frequency should occur every 3rd-5th year	Deleted: 2 Deleted: Annual Deleted: Enhance reproducti ... [66] Deleted: Measure size range ... [67] Deleted: Do focal species ins ... [68]
1	Elkhorn Slough SMR Elkhorn Slough SMP	Protect estuarine area with high bird diversity.	Does MPA contain high bird diversity and is this diversity maintained?	Monitor bird diversity within and outside the area over time. Monitoring frequency should occur upon implementation and every 3rd year thereafter	Deleted: 2 Deleted: other Deleted: Annual Deleted: Is MPA adjacent to ... [69] Deleted: Partially completed ... [70] Deleted: Provide increased r ... [71]

<u>MLPA Goal By Number</u>	<u>MPAs</u>	<u>General Objective</u>	<u>Overarching Question</u>	<u>Potential Monitoring Activity and Frequency</u>	Deleted: 1
1	<u>Elkhorn Slough SMR</u> <u>Elkhorn Slough SMP</u>	<u>Protect area with diversity of estuarine habitats...</u>	<u>Is the habitat present and does it persist in a viable state within the MPA?</u>	<u>Monitor habitat presence, composition, and status over time</u> <u>Monitoring frequency should occur upon implementation and every 3rd year thereafter</u>	Deleted: Upon implementation and every third year thereafter Deleted: Protect estuarine area with high bird diversity. Deleted: Does MPA contain high bird diversity and is this diversity maintained? Deleted: Monitor bird diversity within and outside the area over time.
1	<u>Elkhorn Slough SMR</u> <u>Morro Bay SMRMA</u> <u>Morro Bay SMR</u>	<u>Protect natural structure and food web of estuarine system...</u>	<u>Is the food web integrity greater within the MPA than outside: Do the abundance and size/age structure of key predator and prey species differ inside and outside MPAs in areas of comparable habitat?</u>	<u>Map trophic relationships then estimate biomass for different trophic levels and measure average weight of higher trophic level species where possible</u> <u>Monitoring frequency should occur upon implementation and every 3rd year thereafter</u>	Deleted: Upon Deleted: Is the habitat present and does it persist in a viable state within the MPA? Deleted: Monitor habitat presence, composition, and status over time Deleted: Protect and replicate representative estuarine habitat in central coast region within a state marine reserve.
1	<u>Soquel Canyon SMCA</u> <u>Portuguese Ledge SMCA</u>	<u>Help restore overfished species by maintaining large individuals</u>	<u>Do focal species inside MPAs increase in size, numbers, and biomass relative to areas of similar habitat adjacent to and distant from MPAs?</u>	<u>Measure size range, density, and makeup of focal species assemblage within, near and distant from MPA over time</u> <u>Monitoring frequency should occur annually to every other year</u>	Deleted: 3 Deleted: third Deleted: Upon Deleted: Monitor habitat presence, composition, and status over time
1	<u>Point Sur SMR</u> <u>Point Sur SMCA</u>	<u>Provide protection to species associated with an area that contains a persistent upwelling plume and generally southerly flow, well-suited to provide larval dispersal to other areas.</u>	<u>Proportion of area within which focal species are restored to or maintained at self replenishing levels</u>	<u>Use community structure and focal species size range and density data to model ability to replenish</u> <u>Monitoring frequency should occur every 3rd-5th year in the Point Sur SMR and once upon implementation in the Point Sur SMCA</u>	Deleted: Protect estuarine habitat within a state marine reserve. Deleted: Is the habitat present and does it persist in a viable state within the MPA? Deleted: 4 Deleted: third Deleted: Elkhorn Slough SMR [72] Deleted: Upon implementation [73] Deleted: Does MPA contain [74] Deleted: Monitor bird diversity [75] Deleted: Protect estuarine area [76] Deleted: July 21, 2006 Page

2	Ed Ricketts SMCA	Protect invertebrates and the habitats on which they depend while allowing the harvest of finfish and kelp.	Do species richness and/or diversity stay the same or increase in MPAs relative to areas of similar habitat adjacent to and distant from MPAs?	Measure community structure and species composition including habitat forming species within and outside MPAs over time	Deleted: Upon implementation and every third year thereafter
▼	▼	▼	▼	▼	Deleted: Monitor habitat presence, composition, and status over time
2	Año Nuevo SMR Greyhound Rock SMCA Elkhorn Slough SMR Soquel Canyon SMCA Portuguese Ledge SMCA Point Lobos SMR Point Lobos SMCA Point Sur SMR Point Sur SMCA Big Creek SMCA Big Creek SMR Piedras Blancas SMR Piedras Blancas SMCA Cambria SMR Point Buchon SMR Point Buchon SMCA Vandenberg SMR	Protect larval source and enhance reproductive capacity of various species including overfished species	Do reserves retain large, mature, fecund individuals of selected species and do recruitment rates of selected species change over time inside marine reserves versus areas outside?	Measure size range, density, and makeup of focal species assemblage and relative recruitment ²⁴ rates of selected species inside and outside MPAs	Deleted: Is the habitat present and does it persist in a viable state within the MPA?
▼	▼	▼	▼	▼	Deleted: 1
2	Lovers Point SMR Cambria SMR Morro Bay SMRMA Morro Bay SMR	Protect large individuals of resident marine species in known nursery area.	Do focal species inside MPAs increase in size, numbers, and biomass relative to areas of similar habitat adjacent to and distant from MPAs?	Measure size range, density, and makeup of focal species assemblage within, near and distant from MPA over time	Deleted: Protect area with diversity of estuarine habitats...
▼	▼	▼	▼	▼	Deleted: Protect natural age, size structure, and genetic diversity of some invertebrate species, such as fat innkeeper worms, characteristic of one of largest estuarine systems within the central coast.
					Deleted: Annual
					Deleted: Measure size range, density, and makeup of focal species assemblages within, adjacent to and far from MPAs
					Deleted: Do focal species inside marine reserves increase in size, numbers, and biomass relative to areas of similar habitat adjacent to and distant from MPAs?
					Deleted: 1
					Deleted: Once
					Deleted: Completed by adoption of MPA
					Deleted: Provide for traditional recreational consumptive and nonconsumptive uses while offering some protection due to the prohibition of commercial fishing.
					Deleted: Does the MPA allow for recreational and nonconsumptive uses and prohibit commercial ones?
					Deleted: Moro Cojo Estuary ... [77]
					Deleted: July 21, 2006 Page

²⁴ **Recruitment:** The amount of fish added to the exploitable stock each year due to growth and/or migration into the fishing area. For example, the number of fish that grow to become vulnerable to the fishing gear in one year would be the recruitment to the fishable population that year. This term is also used in referring to the number of fish from a year class reaching a certain age. For example, all fish reaching their second year would be age 2 recruits. (Source: "Technical Terms" NOAA's National Marine Fisheries Service Northeast Fisheries Science Center http://www.nefsc.noaa.gov/techniques/tech_terms.html)

2	<u>Año Nuevo SMR</u> <u>Greyhound Rock SMCA</u> <u>Elkhorn Slough SMR</u> <u>Moro Cojo Lagoon SMR</u> <u>Point Lobos SMR</u> <u>Point Sur SMR</u> <u>Point Sur SMCA</u> <u>Big Creek SMCA</u> <u>Big Creek SMR</u> <u>Morro Bay SMRMA</u> <u>Morro Bay SMR</u> <u>Vandenberg SMR</u>	<u>Help protect various marine birds and mammals by protecting feeding, roosting, and nesting habitat...</u>	<u>Are foraging, roosting, and nesting behaviors different inside MPA versus outside and is disturbance greater in fished areas?</u>	<u>Use visual surveys of area before and after implementation to measure frequency of disturbance from sea and shore-based activities</u> <u>Monitoring should occur prior to implementation and three-times per year for the first 5 years</u>	<p>Deleted: Prior</p> <p>Deleted: Help protect listed marine birds by protecting feeding, roosting, and nesting habitat.</p> <p>Deleted: Are foraging, roosting, and nesting behaviors different inside MPA versus outside and is disturbance greater in fished areas?</p> <p>Deleted: Use visual surveys of area before and after implementation to measure frequency of disturbance from sea and shore-based activities</p>
3	<u>Piedras Blancas SMR</u>	<u>Enhance classroom component of research and monitoring as related to the Friends of the Elephant Seal organization.</u>	<u>Relative measure of ability to convey conservation message using local examples</u>	<u>Survey of students in the program</u> <u>Monitoring should occur prior to implementation then once per year for 5 years</u>	<p>Deleted: 2</p> <p>Deleted: and three-times</p> <p>Deleted: first five</p>
3	<u>Elkhorn Slough SMR</u> <u>Moro Cojo Lagoon SMR</u> <u>Carmel Pinnacles SMR</u> <u>Point Lobos SMR</u> <u>Point Sur SMR</u> <u>Big Creek SMR</u> <u>Piedras Blancas SMR</u> <u>Cambria SMR</u> <u>Morro Bay SMRMA</u> ²⁵ <u>Morro Bay SMR</u> <u>Point Buchon SMR</u> <u>Vandenberg SMR</u>	<u>Replicate representative habitats within state marine reserves</u>	<u>Is the habitat present and does it persist in a viable state within the MPA?</u>	<u>Monitor habitat presence, composition, and status over time</u> <u>Monitoring frequency should occur upon implementation and every 3rd year thereafter</u>	<p>Deleted: Protect and replicate representative estuarine habitat in central coast region within a state marine reserve.</p> <p>Deleted: Upon</p> <p>Deleted: Is the habitat present and does it persist in a viable state within the MPA?</p> <p>Deleted: Monitor habitat presence, composition, and status over time</p>
3	<u>Lovers Point SMR</u> <u>Pacific Grove Marine Gardens SMCA</u> <u>Carmel Pinnacles SMR</u> <u>Point Lobos SMR</u>	<u>Enhance recreational non-consumptive diving experience at site of traditional high diving use...</u>	<u>Are non-consumptive recreational experiences in areas subject to minimal disturbance improving? What are the attitudes and perceptions of users and their recreational experience and how has that changed over time?</u>	<u>Surveys of divers to determine relative satisfaction</u> <u>Frequency of surveys should occur prior to implementation then 2-3 times per year for the first 5 years</u>	<p>Deleted: third</p> <p>Deleted: Upon</p> <p>Deleted: Monitor habitat presence, composition, and status over time</p> <p>Deleted: Protect estuarine habitat within a state marine reserve.</p> <p>Deleted: Is the habitat present and does it persist in a viable state within the MPA?</p> <p>Deleted: and every third</p> <p>Deleted: thereafter</p> <p>Deleted: 4</p> <p>Deleted: Soquel Canyon SM... [78]</p> <p>Deleted: July 21, 2006 Page</p>

²⁵ Though not a true SMR, the Morro Bay SMRMA includes a component of no-take area equivalent in protection to an SMR

3	<u>Pacific Grove Marine Gardens SMCA</u>	<u>Enhance recreational fishing within the state marine conservation area through a prohibition on commercial take and by providing for a natural size and age structure of resident finfish species in an adjacent state marine reserve.</u>	<u>Is recreational fishing success (catch per unit of effort) improving along with changes in focal species size range, abundance and population structure</u>	<u>Surveys of fishermen and fishery dependent data from CRFS program combined with measuring size range, density, and makeup of focal species assemblage</u> <u>Monitoring frequency should occur annually to every other year</u>	Deleted: Protect area with high species diversity associated with submarine canyon... Deleted: Annual to Deleted: Does species richness and/or diversity stay the same or increase in MPAs relative to areas of similar habitat adjacent to and distant from MPAs? Deleted: Measure community structure and species composition including habitat forming species within and outside MPAs over time
4	<u>Año Nuevo SMR</u> <u>Elkhorn Slough SMR</u> <u>Moro Cojo Estuary SMR</u> <u>Carmel Pinnacles SMR</u> <u>Point Lobos SMR</u> <u>Point Sur SMR</u> <u>Big Creek SMR</u> <u>Piedras Blancas SMR</u> <u>Cambria SMR</u> <u>Morro Bay SMR</u> <u>Point Buchon SMR</u> <u>Vandenberg SMR</u>	<u>Include and replicate various habitats in state marine reserves</u>	<u>Is the habitat present and does it persist in a viable state within the MPA?</u>	<u>Monitor habitat presence, composition, and status over time</u> <u>Monitoring frequency should occur upon implementation and every 3rd year thereafter</u>	Deleted: 1 Deleted: other Deleted: Upon implementation and every third year thereafter Deleted: Is the habitat present and does it persist in a viable state within the MPA?
5	<u>Soquel Canyon SMCA</u> <u>Portuguese Ledge SMCA</u> <u>Point Lobos SMCA</u>	<u>Minimize negative socio-economic impacts to the various fisheries while protecting benthic finfishes</u>	<u>Is take of benthic fishes prohibited while take of other species allowed and is catch per unit of effort in these fisheries maintained?</u>	<u>Partially completed by adoption of MPA. Track catch and effort in subject fisheries.</u> <u>Monitoring should occur annually</u>	Deleted: Monitor habitat presence, composition, and status over time Deleted: Help protect area of diverse habitat including shallow hard and soft bottom, deep hard and sq ... [79] Deleted: 1
5	<u>Point Lobos SMR</u> <u>Piedras Blancas SMR</u>	<u>Optimize positive socio-economic benefits by improving protection in area that has particularly high non-consumptive use patterns...</u>	<u>Are non-consumptive recreational experiences in areas subject to minimal disturbance improving? What are the attitudes and perceptions of users and their recreational experience and how has that changed over time?</u>	<u>Surveys of non-consumptive users</u> <u>Frequency of surveys should occur prior to implementation then 2-3 times per year for the first 5 years</u>	Deleted: Annual to every other year Deleted: Measure size range ... [80] Deleted: Do focal species ins ... [81] Deleted: Help restore overfis ... [82] Deleted: 1
5	<u>Point Lobos SMCA</u> <u>Point Sur SMR</u> <u>Point Sur SMCA</u> <u>Big Creek SMCA</u> <u>Big Creek SMR</u> <u>Point Buchon SMCA</u>	<u>Minimize negative socio-economic impacts by incorporating a portion of the Rockfish Conservation Area ... and considering other fisheries</u>	<u>Is take of rockfish prohibited while take of other species continues?</u>	<u>Partially completed by adoption of MPA. Track catch and effort in subject fishery.</u> <u>Monitoring should occur annually</u>	Deleted: Once Deleted: Protect overfished ... [83] Deleted: Does MPA prohibit ... [84] Deleted: Completed by adop ... [85] Deleted: 2 Deleted: 2 ... [86] Deleted: July 21, 2006 Page

Performance Determination

Deleted: Long-term Monitoring Plan¶
Placeholder to describe the specific monitoring activities and locations intended to complete the above plan.¶
¶

Performance will be measured for the network as a whole, for network components, and for groups of MPAs with common objectives. In some instances, performance will be measured for a single MPA to determine if MPA specific goals are met.

In some instances, such as the need to include a diversity of habitats, performance will simply be a measure of the presence or absence and/or quantity of a particular habitat or feature. This can be measured at the individual MPA level or across the network of MPAs.

In other instances to measure performance some metrics will need to be measured and compared against reference sites. With studies conducted in nature, it is not possible to control all factors driving the system. It is possible to compare areas with and without an impact (e.g., establishing MPAs), but measuring the impact requires differentiating the response to the impact to those caused by other factors. In other words, is a response the outcome of a MPA designation? Likewise, is a response due to reduced fishing pressure or reduced pollution, or other factors?

One approach to this problem is Before-After-Control-Impact (BACI) monitoring (Green 1979, Stewart-Oaten 1986). In a BACI design, samples are taken in impacted and reference areas before and after the impact starts (such as before MPA designation). The premise of the BACI design is that treatments can be referenced against some control, in this case the "before" condition. Where applicable the BACI approach will be used.

Similar to the BACI approach reference sites within and outside of MPAs will be used to make comparisons. To accommodate for variance numerous measurements across the range of variability will be made, ensuring that data are collected for the most important factors that drive the system. This approach over time will allow for trends to develop within and outside MPA boundaries.

To support the BACI design some baseline data exists and will be identified. Other baseline data will be gathered across various MPAs and reference sites. The baseline data that will be necessary to achieve the monitoring goals many are identified above. Baseline data and much of the monitoring activities will be solicited through a RFP (request for proposals) process.

The Department will be the lead agency for data management, assessment and communication. Data will be collected from the monitoring programs and outside sources and integrated into a database. Data will be analyzed to evaluate performance of the network and network components relative to the goals and objectives, and provide the information needed for adaptive management. Results and conclusions will be communicated to resource managers and the public. Long-term storage and management of data will be provided by the Department's Biogeographic Data Branch.

Monitoring of fishing effort

For this monitoring program, the most important variable to measure is fishing effort before and after implementation of the MPAs. Populations in MPAs are expected to respond in relation to

Deleted: July 21, 2006 Page

the prior level of fishing, with more response in heavily fished than in lightly fished MPAs. Fishing effort in areas outside MPAs will change not only in response to the MPAs, but also in response to changes in the regulatory, economic and social environment. Because fishing effort in outside areas is variable both temporally and spatially, all MPA/reference comparisons will need to consider fishing effort. The evaluation of MPAs will also need to consider if displaced fishing effort is affecting areas outside of MPAs.

Recreational fishing will be monitored through the Department's California Recreational Fishing Survey (CRFS) which collects data on catch and fishing effort for private and rental boats, commercial passenger fishing vessels (CPFVs), man-made structures such as piers and jetties, and beaches and banks. The data can be referenced to 1 minute of latitude by 1 minute of longitude (approximately 1 square nautical mile), a scale that will allow analysis at the level of an individual MPA. The survey began in 2004 as a modification of a previous recreational fishing survey, and will continue through time. CRFS is a source of baseline and post-implementation data. Logbooks submitted to the Department from CPFVs will also provide valuable long-term data.

Collecting data for commercial fishing is more problematic. Data from logbooks submitted to the Department are available for spot prawn, and squid, although spot prawn data do not have fine spatial resolution. Data for other types of commercial fishing will need to be collected from a new program. Methods could include shipboard transponders and/or observers, remote sensing or aerial surveys, and/or incentive-based voluntary reporting. Information on preferred areas for fishing collected by Ecotrust can serve as a proxy for pre-implementation fishing effort.

Monitoring by habitat

Monitoring activities are presented in order of priority. Recommendations of the Baseline Science-Management Panel (BSMP) were considered when setting priorities, but modified for the purpose of long-term monitoring. Deep water rocky habitat was ranked first because it supports many of the species mentioned in the objectives (e.g., rockfish and other groundfish species) and, based on the Ecotrust analysis; this habitat has had the most consumptive use. Shallow rocky habitat, including kelp beds, was ranked second because it supports many of the species mentioned in the objectives. Since habitat mapping is required for the evaluation of Goal 4 and many MPA-specific objectives, it is considered high priority and ranked third. Within medium priority activities, deep water soft bottom and rocky intertidal were ranked one and two, respectively. Low priority activities are not included here. Measuring residence time of species is needed to evaluate the level of protection afforded by MPAs and is considered for each habitat type.

Deep Water (> 30m) Hard Bottom Monitoring

Eighteen MPAs have deep water (> 30 m) hard bottom habitat (Table 7) with seven having habitat in >100 m. For logistical reasons MPAs with little hard bottom habitat or those that are not well mapped will not be monitored. MPAs that have been identified by the science panel as either having substantial hard bottom habitat > 0.25 mi² or are of interest for other reasons will have long term monitoring. Based on the known amount of available hard bottom habitat and professional judgment the science panel identified 12 MPAs that should be sampled: Soquel

Deleted: July 21, 2006 Page

Canyon SMCA, Portuguese Ledge SMCA, Carmel Pinnacles SMR, Pt Lobos SMR, Point Lobos SMCA, Point Sur SMR, Point Sur SMCA, Big Creek SMR, Big Creek SMCA, Piedras Blancas SMCA, Point Buchon SMR, and Point Buchon SMCA. It must be noted that as the pool of knowledge increases on these areas MPAs the monitoring list may be modified.

Table 7. MPAs with deep water (> 30 m) hard bottom habitat (area in mi²).

MPA Name	30-100 m	100-200 m	>200 m
Soquel Canyon SMCA	2.38	2.05	0.87
Portuguese Ledge SMCA	0.38	1.62	1.51
Pacific Grove Marine Gardens SMCA	0.14	0	0
Asilomar SMR	0.08	0	0
Carmel Pinnacles SMR	0.37	0	0
Carmel Bay SMCA	0.04	0	0
Pt. Lobos SMR	1.13	0	0
Pt. Lobos SMCA	0.26	1.64	0.95
Point Sur SMR	1.8	0	0
Point Sur SMCA	1.84	0.01	0
Big Creek SMCA	0.06	0.05	0.02
Big Creek SMR	0.11	0.01	0.03
Piedras Blancas SMR	0.15	0	0
Piedras Blancas SMCA	0.56	0	0
Cambria SMR	0.02	0	0
Point Buchon SMR	0.75	0	0
Point Buchon SMCA	0.69	0.02	0
Vandenberg SMR	0.25	0	0

The Science Advisory Team recommended a list of species likely to benefit from MPAs. From this list focal species (Table 8) were identified to provide direct comparisons to reference sites outside the MPAs. The focal species will provide one measure with which to monitor change in populations over time.

Table 8. Focal fish and invertebrate species for deep water (> 30m) hard bottom habitats.

Common Name	Scientific Name	Reason for Selection
bocaccio	<i>Sebastes paucispinis</i>	shift number, size ¹
cowcod	<i>Sebastes levis</i>	shift number, size ¹
lingcod	<i>Ophiodon elongatus</i>	shift number ¹
blue rockfish	<i>Sebastes mystinus</i>	shift number, size ¹
greenspotted rockfish	<i>Sebastes chlorostictus</i>	shift size ¹
copper rockfish	<i>Sebastes caurinus</i>	shift size ¹
olive rockfish	<i>Sebastes serranoides</i>	shift size ¹
squarespot rockfish	<i>Sebastes hopkinsi</i>	fished
yelloweye rockfish	<i>Sebastes ruberrimus</i>	shift number ¹
yellowtail rockfish	<i>Sebastes flavidus</i>	shift size ¹
widow rockfish	<i>Sebastes entomelas</i>	shift number ¹
vermillion rockfish	<i>Sebastes miniatus</i>	shift size ¹
galatheid crabs	Galatheididae	incidental catch in spot prawn fishery
red rock crab	<i>Cancer productus</i>	fished, incidental catch in spot

Deleted: July 21, 2006 Page

<u>Common Name</u>	<u>Scientific Name</u>	<u>Reason for Selection</u>
		<u>prawn fishery</u>
<u>box crab</u>	<u><i>Lopholithodes foraminatus</i></u>	<u>fished, incidental catch in spot prawn fishery</u>
<u>crinoids</u>	<u><i>Florometra serratissima</i></u>	<u>habitat forming</u>
<u>sponges</u>	<u>Porifera</u>	<u>habitat forming</u>
<u>anemones</u>	<u><i>Metridium spp.</i>, <i>Urticina picivora</i></u>	<u>habitat forming</u>
<u>black corals</u>	<u><i>Antipathes spp.</i></u>	<u>ecosystem component</u>
<u>basket stars</u>	<u><i>Gorgonocephalis eucemis</i></u>	<u>habitat forming</u>
<u>sea stars</u>	<u><i>Ceramaster spp.</i>, <i>Mediaster aequilis</i>, <i>Pteraster spp.</i></u>	<u>predatory</u>
<u>spot prawn</u>	<u><i>Pandalus platyceros</i></u>	<u>fished</u>

¹ Shift number, size means that studies have shown that populations have been reduced in abundance (or density) and/or the size distribution has been altered

Existing data on deep water habitats is limited for the central coast region but will be critical in establishing baseline information. In 2003, the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) extended the sampling area for their annual trawl surveys for groundfish to include all of Washington, Oregon and California from approximately 55 to 1280 m. To avoid losing the nets, higher relief areas are avoided, but the trawls do sample lower relief hard bottom habitat. In 1992-1993 Yoklavich, et al. (2000) surveyed benthic fish populations in Soquel Canyon. In 1997-1998 Yoklavich, et al. (2002) surveyed benthic fish populations inside and outside of the Big Creek Marine Ecological Reserve (now Big Creek State Marine Reserve). Both surveys were conducted with a submersible. Strip transects were videotaped to provide documentation of fish abundance and habitat type.

For the Channel Islands MPA monitoring program in southern California, a Remotely Operated Vehicle (ROV) is used to survey fish in hard bottom habitats beyond the reach of divers (20-80 m) (<http://www.dfg.ca.gov/mrd/fir/dss.html>). Survey techniques used in ROV and submersible surveys are similar, but not identical. To compare methods, Dr. Milton Love and Donna Schroeder surveyed two of the ROV survey sites with a submersible in 2005. Results of the comparison should be available soon. Nasby et al. (2002) integrated detailed seafloor mapping and submersible transects to estimate fish densities across broad areas of a deepwater bank off Oregon.

To provide standardized baseline information the science panel developed a stratified random block sample design intended to be robust enough to allow for different methodologies, such as ROV, AUV, or towed camera surveys. Deep water hard bottom habitats will be stratified by depth; 30-100m, 100-200m, and >200m. Based on the current knowledge of habitat distribution, a grid with blocks 500m x 500m (exact grid size may change as specific protocols and sites are further refined) will be placed on maps depicting hard bottom habitats. Blocks will be randomly selected within each stratum. Certain criteria, e.g. blocks may not be adjacent to each other, may be applied to ensure the distribution of blocks is representative of the habitat within each strata. Each of these blocks will provide the core of the sampling and will be re-surveyed each year. Similarly, blocks will be selected at reference sites that contain similar habitat in each of the identified strata.

Deleted: July 21, 2006 Page

At each sample block replicate transects will be surveyed. Transect direction will be random/haphazard for each survey block and each year. Transect length will be determined as protocol are refined but based on suggestions by the science panel are initially set to be 100-150m in length.

Existing survey techniques can be used to measure size and density of conspicuous benthic fish and invertebrates, including all focal fish species (Table 8), although some work will be needed to create detailed sampling protocols, including quality assurance/quality control (QA/QC). Survey methods need to be developed for invertebrates.

Transect survey techniques should provide data for all focal invertebrates, except crabs and spot prawn, which will need to be sampled with traps. In areas with limited visibility, sampling with traps and/or fishing gear will be needed.

Targeted research/monitoring projects can provide data on residence times of selected focal species. Starr et al. (2000, 2002) have developed techniques for tagging and tracking deep water species such as bocaccio and greenspotted rockfishes. Monitoring activities that addresses these questions and details on other non-visual monitoring programs will be provided as those projects develop.

Shallow Water (< 30m) Hard Bottom Monitoring

Eighteen MPAs have shallow water (< 30m) hard bottom habitat (Table 9).

Table 9. MPAs with shallow water (< 30m) hard bottom habitat (area in mi²).

<u>MPA Name</u>	<u>Hard 0-30</u>	<u>Average Kelp</u>	<u>PISCO Sampling Site</u>
<u>Año Nuevo SMR</u>	<u>3.56</u>	<u>0.01</u>	<u>X</u>
<u>Greyhound Rock SMCA</u>	<u>1.96</u>	<u>0.01</u>	<u>X</u>
<u>Natural Bridges SMR</u>	<u>0.58</u>	<u>0.02</u>	<u>X</u>
<u>Edward F. Ricketts SMCA</u>	<u>0.06</u>	<u>0.05</u>	<u>X</u>
<u>Lovers Point SMR</u>	<u>0.09</u>	<u>0.08</u>	<u>X</u>
<u>Pacific Grove Marine Gardens SMCA</u>	<u>0.48</u>	<u>0.14</u>	
<u>Asilomar SMR</u>	<u>0.59</u>	<u>0.11</u>	
<u>Carmel Pinnacles SMR</u>	<u>0.07</u>	<u>0.01</u>	
<u>Carmel Bay SMCA</u>	<u>0.71</u>	<u>0.30</u>	<u>X</u>
<u>Pt. Lobos SMR</u>	<u>1.03</u>	<u>0.27</u>	<u>X</u>
<u>Point Sur SMR</u>	<u>3.41</u>	<u>0.84</u>	<u>X</u>
<u>Big Creek SMCA</u>	<u>0.40</u>	<u>0.17</u>	
<u>Big Creek SMR</u>	<u>0.57</u>	<u>0.21</u>	<u>X</u>
<u>Piedras Blancas SMR</u>	<u>1.60</u>	<u>0.50</u>	<u>X</u>
<u>Cambria SMP</u>	<u>1.34</u>	<u>0.57</u>	<u>X</u>
<u>Cambria SMR</u>	<u>1.02</u>	<u>0.38</u>	<u>X</u>
<u>Point Buchon SMR</u>	<u>0.60</u>	<u>0.21</u>	
<u>Vandenberg SMR</u>	<u>3.27</u>	<u>0.02</u>	<u>X</u>

Deleted: July 21, 2006 Page

Visual surveys will provide data for all focal species (Table 10), except grass rockfish, cabezon, and brown rock crab. Traps and/or hook and line fishing will be needed for these species and to sample areas with limited visibility. At some sites, particularly Año Nuevo SMR, and Greyhound Rock SMCA, where diver safety precludes scuba surveys, ROVs may be used.

Table 10. Focal fish and invertebrate species for shallow water (< 30m) hard bottom habitats.

Common Name	Scientific name	Reason for selection
lingcod	<i>Ophiodon elongatus</i>	shift number ¹
kelp greenling	<i>Hexagrammos decagrammus</i>	fished
grass rockfish	<i>Sebastes rastrelliger</i>	fished
brown rockfish	<i>Sebastes auriculatus</i>	fished
vermillion rockfish	<i>Sebastes miniatus</i>	shift size ¹
copper rockfish	<i>Sebastes caurinus</i>	shift size ¹
black rockfish	<i>Sebastes melanops</i>	shift number ¹
blue rockfish	<i>Sebastes mystinus</i>	shift size ¹
olive rockfish	<i>Sebastes serranoides</i>	shift size ¹
gopher rockfish	<i>Sebastes carnatus</i>	fished
kelp rockfish	<i>Sebastes atrovirens</i>	fished
cabezon	<i>Scorpaenichthys marmoratus</i>	fished
black surfperch	<i>Embiotoca jacksoni</i>	major component of ecosystem
striped surfperch	<i>Embiotoca lateralis</i>	major component of ecosystem
abalones	<i>Haliotis spp</i>	shift number, size ¹
red urchin	<i>Strongylocentrotus franciscanus</i>	fished, removal affects other species
purple urchin	<i>Strongylocentrotus purpuratus</i>	population level affects other species
sea stars	<i>Pisaster spp.</i>	keystone species
brown rock crab	<i>Cancer antennarius</i>	fished
bull kelp	<i>Nereocystis luetkeana</i>	habitat forming
giant kelp	<i>Macrocystis pyrifera</i>	habitat forming

¹ Shift number, size means that studies have shown that populations have been reduced in abundance (or density) and/or the size distribution has been altered

The Partnership for Interdisciplinary Studies of Coastal Oceans (PISCO) has ongoing monitoring at 14 sites within the central coast region, with 10 inside MPAs (Table 9). Sites have been sampled annually, starting between 1999 and 2004, depending on the site. Divers conduct visual surveys of conspicuous fish species and count selected invertebrate and algal species along replicate 30 x 2 m transects. Uniform contact sampling is used to measure substrate type and relief as well as the percent cover of benthic organisms. Additionally, the monitoring program for the Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant has been sampling for fish and invertebrates since 1978 (Tenera 1998).

Reef Check, a volunteer organization, has 12 stations in the central coast region, 11 in MPAs. Additional sites inside and outside MPAs will be added as the program expands. Sampling began in the fall of 2006 and will continue twice a year in the spring and fall. Reef Check protocols are adapted from the PISCO/CRANE protocols and will provide density and size

Deleted: July 21, 2006 Page

information for all the focal species. Surveys are limited to depths less than 18 m. Reef Check has recently entered into an MOU to provide monitoring data to CDFG.

The Cooperative Research and Assessment of Nearshore Ecosystems (CRANE) Program is a collaborative monitoring program between CDFG and various universities, private organizations, and government programs designed to provide data for fishery management and performance of marine protected areas. The CRANE program began sampling in 2004 and included several sites within existing MPAs. The CRANE program will provide the basic framework for monitoring and performance evaluation. The CRANE program was specifically developed as collaboration and will therefore utilize and expand on partnerships. Details about the CRANE program can be found at <http://www.dfg.ca.gov/MRD/fir/sss.html#crane>.

Deep Water (> 30m) Soft Bottom Monitoring

Twenty-one MPAs have mid and deep water (> 30m) soft bottom habitat (Table 11). All 21 have habitat between 30 and 100 m; 7 have habitat in deeper water. Additionally, a list of focal species has been developed for this habitat (Table 12).

Table 11. MPAs with mid and deep water (>30 m) soft bottom habitat (area in mi²).

<u>MPA Name</u>	<u>Soft 30-100 m</u>	<u>Soft 100-200 m</u>	<u>Soft >200 m</u>
<u>Año Nuevo SMR</u>	<u>2.70</u>	<u>0.00</u>	<u>0.00</u>
<u>Greyhound Rock SMCA</u>	<u>9.03</u>	<u>0.00</u>	<u>0.00</u>
<u>Soquel Canyon SMCA</u>	<u>13.20</u>	<u>1.77</u>	<u>3.14</u>
<u>Portuguese Ledge SMCA</u>	<u>1.46</u>	<u>4.45</u>	<u>1.48</u>
<u>Pacific Grove Marine Gardens SMCA</u>	<u>0.02</u>	<u>0.00</u>	<u>0.00</u>
<u>Asilomar SMR</u>	<u>0.01</u>	<u>0.00</u>	<u>0.00</u>
<u>Carmel Pinnacles SMR</u>	<u>0.07</u>	<u>0.00</u>	<u>0.00</u>
<u>Carmel Bay SMCA</u>	<u>0.05</u>	<u>0.00</u>	<u>0.00</u>
<u>Pt. Lobos SMR</u>	<u>2.32</u>	<u>0.06</u>	<u>0.00</u>
<u>Pt. Lobos SMCA</u>	<u>0.18</u>	<u>2.94</u>	<u>2.88</u>
<u>Point Sur SMR</u>	<u>2.34</u>	<u>0.00</u>	<u>0.00</u>
<u>Point Sur SMCA</u>	<u>8.10</u>	<u>0.00</u>	<u>0.00</u>
<u>Big Creek SMCA</u>	<u>2.19</u>	<u>0.36</u>	<u>6.12</u>
<u>Big Creek SMR</u>	<u>2.61</u>	<u>0.84</u>	<u>7.05</u>
<u>Piedras Blancas SMR</u>	<u>2.56</u>	<u>0.00</u>	<u>0.00</u>
<u>Piedras Blancas SMCA</u>	<u>8.20</u>	<u>0.00</u>	<u>0.00</u>
<u>Cambria SMP</u>	<u>0.44</u>	<u>0.00</u>	<u>0.00</u>
<u>Cambria SMR</u>	<u>0.33</u>	<u>0.00</u>	<u>0.00</u>
<u>Point Buchon SMR</u>	<u>4.66</u>	<u>0.00</u>	<u>0.00</u>
<u>Point Buchon SMCA</u>	<u>7.93</u>	<u>2.91</u>	<u>0.00</u>
<u>Vandenberg SMR</u>	<u>9.69</u>	<u>0.00</u>	<u>0.00</u>

Deleted: July 21, 2006 Page

Table 12. Focal fish and invertebrate species for mid and deep water (> 30 m) soft bottom habitats.

Common Name	Scientific Name	Reason for Selection
petrale sole	<i>Eopsetta jordani</i>	shift number, size
Dover sole	<i>Microstomus pacificus</i>	fished
English sole	<i>Parophrys vetulus</i>	fished
slender sole	<i>Lyopsetta exilis</i>	fished
rex sole	<i>Glyptocephalus zachirus</i>	fished
Pacific sandab	<i>Citharichthys sordidus</i>	fished
sablefish	<i>Anoplopoma fimbria</i>	fished
splitnose rockfish	<i>Sebastes diploproa</i>	fished
chilipepper	<i>Sebastes goodei</i>	fished
spotted ratfish	<i>Hydrolagus coliei</i>	ecosystem component
shortspine thornyhead	<i>Sebastolobus alascanus</i>	fished
longspine thornyhead	<i>Sebastolobus altivelis</i>	fished
California skate	<i>Raja inornata</i>	fished
longnose skate	<i>Raja rhina</i>	fished
sea pens	<i>Stylatula spp.</i> , <i>Ptilosarchus spp.</i> , <i>Anthoptilum spp.</i>	habitat forming
flat mud star	<i>Luidia foliolata</i>	predator
sunflower star	<i>Pycnopodia helianthoides</i>	predator
carpet star	<i>Thrissacanthias penicillatus</i>	predator
fragile red sea urchin	<i>Allocentrotus fragilis</i>	ecosystem component
Dungeness crab	<i>Cancer magister</i>	fished

Monitoring protocols used to survey hard bottom habitat can be adapted to monitor soft bottom habitats. However, besides the annual trawl survey by NMFS described in “Deep Water (>30m) Hard Bottom Monitoring”, there is no ongoing monitoring of mid and deep water soft bottom habitats. Submersible surveys by Yoklavich, et al. (2000) in Soquel Canyon, and Yoklavich, et al. (2002) in and adjacent to Big Creek Marine Ecological Reserve (now Big Creek SMR) included deep water soft bottom habitat. Hixon and Tissot (2007) ran submersible transects for fishes and invertebrates over deep mud seafloors off Oregon. Visual survey techniques will capture all focal species except Dungeness crab, which can be sampled with traps. Trawls can also be used. Trawls can capture all species, although sea pens may be under-represented because they anchor into the substrate.

Specific monitoring activities for mid and deep water (>30 m) soft bottom habitats will be presented as programs develop.

Rocky Intertidal Monitoring

Twelve MPAs have rocky intertidal habitat (Table 13). The Multi-Agency Rocky Intertidal Network (MARINe), a partnership of more than 40 federal, state, academic and other institutions, monitors 20 sites in the central coast region; five sites are inside MPAs (Table 13). The focal species for rocky intertidal monitoring are presented in table 14.

Deleted: July 21, 2006 Page

Table 13. MPAs with rocky intertidal habitat (area in mi²).

<u>MPA Name</u>	<u>Rocky intertidal</u>	<u>MARINE monitoring site</u>
<u>Año Nuevo SMR</u>	<u>4.89</u>	
<u>Greyhound Rock SMCA</u>	<u>3.31</u>	<u>X</u>
<u>Natural Bridges SMR</u>	<u>3.58</u>	
<u>Edward F. Ricketts SMCA</u>	<u>0.8</u>	
<u>Lovers Point SMR</u>	<u>1.42</u>	<u>X</u>
<u>Pacific Grove Marine Gardens SMCA</u>	<u>1.92</u>	
<u>Asilomar SMR</u>	<u>2.85</u>	
<u>Carmel Bay SMCA</u>	<u>2.62</u>	<u>X</u>
<u>Pt. Lobos SMR</u>	<u>13.67</u>	<u>X</u>
<u>Point Sur SMR</u>	<u>3.71</u>	<u>X</u>
<u>Big Creek SMCA</u>	<u>1.77</u>	
<u>Big Creek SMR</u>	<u>2.95</u>	
<u>Piedras Blancas SMR</u>	<u>5.83</u>	<u>X</u>
<u>Cambria SMP</u>	<u>3.77</u>	
<u>Cambria SMR</u>	<u>4</u>	
<u>Morro Bay SMRMA</u>	<u>0.18</u>	
<u>Point Buchon SMR</u>	<u>2.74</u>	
<u>Vandenberg SMR</u>	<u>9.55</u>	<u>X</u>

Table 14. Focal fish and invertebrate species for intertidal hard bottom habitats.

<u>Common Name</u>	<u>Scientific Name</u>	<u>Reason for Selection</u>
<u>black abalone</u>	<u><i>Haliotis cracherodii</i></u>	<u>shift number, size</u>
<u>owl limpet</u>	<u><i>Lottia gigantea</i></u>	<u>shift size</u>
<u>California mussel</u>	<u><i>Mytilus californianus</i></u>	<u>habitat forming</u>
<u>ochre sea star</u>	<u><i>Pisaster ochraceus</i></u>	<u>keystone species</u>
<u>aggregating anemone</u>	<u><i>Anthropleura elegantissima/sola</i></u>	<u>ecosystem component</u>
<u>small acorn barnacle</u>	<u><i>Chthamalus dalli/fissus/Balanus glandula</i></u>	<u>ecosystem component</u>
<u>large acorn barnacle</u>	<u><i>Tetraclita rubescens</i></u>	<u>ecosystem component</u>
<u>gooseneck barnacle</u>	<u><i>Pollicipes polymerus</i></u>	<u>ecosystem component</u>
<u>turban snail</u>	<u><i>Tegula funebris</i></u>	<u>harvested</u>
<u>feather boa kelp</u>	<u><i>Egregia menziesii</i></u>	<u>habitat forming</u>
<u>Rockweed</u>	<u><i>Hesperophycus californicus</i></u>	<u>habitat forming</u>
<u>Rockweed</u>	<u><i>Silvetia compressa</i></u>	<u>habitat forming</u>
<u>Turfweed</u>	<u><i>Endocladia muricata</i></u>	<u>habitat forming</u>
<u>Surfgrass</u>	<u><i>Phyllospadix scouleri/torreyi</i></u>	<u>habitat forming</u>
<u>monkeyface prickleback</u>	<u><i>Cebidichthys violaceus</i></u>	<u>local depletion</u>

MARINE uses two sampling protocols: a “core” protocol that measures the percent cover of 12 target species (Table 14), and a more intensive “biodiversity” protocol. Core sites are sampled twice a year in the fall and spring. Biodiversity sampling occurs irregularly. The spatial and temporal extent of the MARINE program will provide valuable long-term baseline information for the evaluation of MPAs.

Deleted: July 21, 2006 Page

The percent cover of target species as well as other associated species is measured by photographing approximately five permanent 50 X 75 cm plots established in areas of high target species density. The photographs are then scored in the laboratory using point-contact methods. In areas with sufficient populations, the number and size distribution of owl limpets (*Lottia gigantea*) is measured in five permanent circular plots. Band transects or irregularly-shaped plots, depending on the site, are used to estimate the number and size of black abalone (*Haliotis cracherodii*) and seastars (primarily *Pisaster ochraceus*). Timed searches are used where densities are too low for band transects. The cover of surfgrass and associated species is measured on approximately three permanent transects, 10 m long, with point contact methods.

The list of focal species for intertidal hardbottom monitoring and MARINe target species (Table 14) are identical except for the inclusion of turban snails and monkeyface prickleback. These two species were included because they are harvested. While turban snails are not a MARINe target species, they are sampled annually. MARINe protocols will not provide data for fish such as the monkeyface prickleback. Special studies, including trapping and/or hook and line fishing using the traditional recreational gear known as a "poke pole", will be needed for this species.

It is expected that additional monitoring will closely follow MARINe protocols. However, it may be necessary in some instances to augment the sampling with additional replication and/or random sampling.

Marine Mammal and Seabird Monitoring

If some fish and invertebrate species increase in size and number as expected, MPAs may affect seabirds and marine mammals by increasing or shifting their forage base.

Focal seabirds and marine mammals (Table 15) occur throughout the central coast region.

Table 15. Focal marine birds and mammals.

Common Name	Scientific Name	Reason for Selection
Marine Birds		
Brandt's cormorant	<i>Phalacrocorax penicillatus</i>	disturbance, increase in forage base
brown pelican	<i>Pelecanus occidentalis</i>	disturbance, increase in forage base
common murre	<i>Uria aalge</i>	disturbance, increase in forage base
double-crested cormorant	<i>Phalacrocorax auritus</i>	disturbance, increase in forage base
pelagic cormorant	<i>Phalacrocorax pelagicus</i>	disturbance, increase in forage base
rhinoceros auklet	<i>Cerorhinca monocerata</i>	disturbance, increase in forage base
pigeon guillemot	<i>Cepphus columba</i>	disturbance, increase in forage base
grebes	<i>Podicipedidae</i>	increase in forage base
loons	<i>Gaviidae</i>	increase in forage base
marbled murrelet	<i>Brachramphus marmoratus</i>	disturbance, increase in forage base
sooty shearwater	<i>Puffinus griseus</i>	hot spots for prey, indicator of prey

Deleted: July 21, 2006 Page

<u>Common Name</u>	<u>Scientific Name</u>	<u>Reason for Selection</u>
<u>Marine Birds</u>		
		<u>availability</u>
<u>Cassin's auklet</u>	<u><i>Ptychoramphus aleuticus</i></u>	<u>Indicator of krill and larval fish abundance</u>
<u>black oyster catcher</u>	<u><i>Haematopus bachmani</i></u>	<u>intertidal ecosystem component</u>
<u>Marine Mammals</u>		
<u>sea otter</u>	<u><i>Enhydra lutris</i></u>	<u>keystone species</u>
<u>California sea lion</u>	<u><i>Zalophus californianus</i></u>	<u>predator</u>
<u>harbor seal</u>	<u><i>Phoca vitulina</i></u>	<u>predator</u>
<u>elephant seal</u>	<u><i>Mirounga angustirostris</i></u>	<u>predator</u>
<u>harbor porpoise</u>	<u><i>Phocoena phocoena</i></u>	<u>aggregate in specific areas</u>

Aerial, shoreline, and strip surveys can be used to measure the distribution and abundance and foraging patterns of focal species of seabirds and mammals. Surveys of breeding sites can measure breeding success (number of offspring per adult). Studies of diet can provide information for evaluation of foraging behavior and reproductive success, as well as information on the availability of prey species. Although no specific monitoring protocol has been established to monitor marine mammals or seabirds existing programs may meet many of the monitoring needs.

NMFS and the Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary (MBNMS) have a program called Collaborative Survey of Cetacean Abundance and the Pelagic Ecosystem (CSCAPE) which conducts annual surveys of marine mammals. Track lines are surveyed on a large scale grid (~160 km) from the US/Canadian border to the US/Mexico border and on a smaller grid (18.5 km) within the boundaries of the MBNMS. Although the survey targets marine mammals, seabirds are also recorded. The sampling provides good information on abundances, but the grid is too large for monitoring individual MPAs.

The United States Geological Service (USGS) conducts surveys of sea otters in the spring and fall in the area between Monterey Bay and Santa Barbara. Sightings are made from shore or with aerial surveys in inaccessible areas. Burney LeBoeuf, at U.C. Santa Cruz, has conducted annual surveys of elephant seals in the MBNMS since 1968.

Dr. Jim Harvey and students at the Moss Landing Marine Laboratory conduct biannual surveys of shorebirds and annual surveys of harbor seals and sea otters in Elkhorn Slough. Elkhorn Slough National Estuarine Research Reserve program volunteers have surveyed shorebirds at 24 sites bimonthly since 1998. Surveys are also conducted at rookeries to determine breeding success for herons, egrets, cormorants and Caspian terns.

Shorebird populations in Morro Bay have been monitored biannually by Morro Bay National Estuary Program volunteers in conjunction with the PRBO Conservation Science (PRBO). Since 1992, from April through August, PRBO has conducted weekly surveys of seabird abundance, breeding performance, and diet at Año Nuevo Island and monthly diet surveys since 2001. At Vandenberg SMR, PRBO has conducted weekly surveys (April through August) of breeding seabird population size and performance since 1999 and seabird diets and seabird

Deleted: July 21, 2006 Page

and marine mammal foraging distributions since 2000. Roosting seabird distributions have been surveyed biweekly from January through December since 2001.

Coastal Marsh and Estuary Monitoring

Nine MPAs have coastal marsh and estuarine habitat (Table 16); most of the habitat is in Elkhorn Slough and Morro Bay. The list of focal species created for estuarine habitats is presented in table 17.

Table 16. MPAs with coastal marsh and estuary habitat (area in mi²).

<u>MPA Name</u>	<u>Coastal marsh</u>	<u>Tidal flats</u>	<u>Eelgrass</u>	<u>Estuary</u>
<u>Natural Bridges SMR</u>	<u>0.68</u>	<u>0.00</u>	<u>0.00</u>	<u>0.00</u>
<u>Elkhorn Slough SMR</u>	<u>9.16</u>	<u>9.16</u>	<u>0.03</u>	<u>1.48</u>
<u>Elkhorn Slough SMP</u>	<u>0.95</u>	<u>0.99</u>	<u>0.01</u>	<u>0.09</u>
<u>Moro Cojo SMR</u>	<u>0.00</u>	<u>0.00</u>	<u>0.00</u>	<u>0.46</u>
<u>Piedras Blancas SMR</u>	<u>0.00</u>	<u>0.00</u>	<u>0.00</u>	<u>0.01</u>
<u>Cambria SMP</u>	<u>0.47</u>	<u>0.15</u>	<u>0.00</u>	<u>0.01</u>
<u>Morro Bay SMR</u>	<u>1.52</u>	<u>0.72</u>	<u>0.00</u>	<u>0.3</u>
<u>Morro Bay SMRMA</u>	<u>6.69</u>	<u>5.23</u>	<u>1.04</u>	<u>3.01</u>
<u>Vandenberg SMR</u>	<u>0.01</u>	<u>0.01</u>	<u>0.00</u>	<u>0.00</u>

Table 17. Focal species for estuaries.

<u>Common Name</u>	<u>Scientific Name</u>	<u>Reason for Selection</u>
<u>topsmelt</u>	<u>Atherinops affinis</u>	<u>lay eggs on plants</u>
<u>leopard shark</u>	<u>Triakis semifasciata</u>	<u>use estuary as nursery, fished</u>
<u>black surfperch</u>	<u>Embiotoca jacksoni</u>	<u>fished</u>
<u>shiner surfperch</u>	<u>Cymatogaster aggregata</u>	<u>fished</u>
<u>ghost shrimp</u>	<u>Calianassa spp.</u>	<u>collected for bait</u>
<u>innkeeper worm</u>	<u>Urechis caupo</u>	<u>ecosystem component</u>
<u>gaper clams</u>	<u>Tresus spp.</u>	<u>ecosystem component</u>
<u>eelgrass</u>	<u>Zostera spp.</u>	<u>habitat forming</u>

Both Elkhorn Slough and Morro Bay have ongoing monitoring. As part of the Elkhorn Slough National Estuarine Research Reserve program, volunteers have collected water quality samples monthly at 24 stations since 1998. Baited traps are used to capture crabs and visual surveys are done of surface burrow structures to measure populations of gaper clams, fat innkeeper worms, and ghost shrimp. Since 1994, Morro Bay National Estuary Program volunteers have conducted annual aerial and sonar surveys to map the distribution and abundance of eelgrass in the Bay.

Ongoing monitoring will provide sufficient information for some focal species (Table 15). Monitoring in Elkhorn Slough will provide information for ghost shrimp, innkeeper worms, and gaper clams. Surveys would need to be conducted in Morro Bay for these species. Eelgrass is mapped in Morro Bay, but not in Elkhorn Slough. Given the limited amount of habitat, mapping eelgrass in Elkhorn Slough may not be cost effective.

At present, there is no ongoing monitoring for focal fish species in Morro Bay or Elkhorn Slough. In Elkhorn Slough there is some historical data from Moss Landing Marine Lab

Deleted: July 21, 2006 Page

research projects and class trawls, but nothing after 2003. Trawl, gill net, and/or trap sampling will be needed for the evaluation of focal fish species. Details on these programs will be added as they are developed.

Socioeconomic monitoring

To evaluate changes in opportunities for recreation, education and research (goal 3), it will be necessary to measure activities within and outside MPAs before and after implementation. In contrast to the biophysical system, impacts on activities will begin to occur simultaneously with implementation. In this case, a baseline can be established with existing data and/or user surveys. If the MPAs function as expected, the level of activity should increase inside MPAs.

The MPA-specific objective to increase positive socioeconomic benefits applies primarily to non-consumptive uses in Piedras Blancas SMR, recreational fishing in Cambria SMP, and non-consumptive diving in Hopkins SMR, Pacific Grove SMCA, Asilomar SMR, Carmel Pinnacles SMR, and Point Lobos SMR. Priorities for monitoring developed by the BSMP are provided in the following text; however, priorities for baseline and long-term monitoring will differ. As noted in the report of the MLPA Initiative Staff (2006), prioritization is primarily a policy decision, not a scientific judgment.

Non-Consumptive Recreation, Education, and Research

Establishing a baseline for the indicators described above in Long-term and Ongoing Monitoring will require surveys, literature reviews or other data collection, as there is little existing information. Most of the existing information on recreational activities is aggregated at the level of the county and state, a scale too large to be useful for evaluating the central coast network or individual MPAs. LaFranchi and Tamanaka (2005) conducted a preliminary survey of recreational use in Monterey and Santa Cruz Counties. These data are useful, but limited in scope.

Surveys of non-consumptive users as well as educational and research institutions can be done via mail or the internet or, in the case of present use, by intercepting people on site. Survey instruments can be designed to collect information about the time and location of use, attitudes, perceptions, and cost. The Baseline Science and Monitoring Panel (BSMP) considered a survey of divers' high priority because divers are most directly affected by MPA designation. The survey would include effort by location and time, travel cost and expenditures. Including other user groups (kayakers, wildlife viewing and unplanned activities) and information on knowledge, attitudes, and perceptions for all users was considered medium priority.

A literature search can be conducted to establish a baseline number of research publications as well as the number of post-implementation citations.

Consumptive Uses

As noted above, determining the location and intensity of fishing before and after implementation of the MPAs is critical to the assessment of biophysical impacts (e.g. from displaced fishing effort, see discussion above on monitoring fishing effort) as well as socioeconomic impacts.

Deleted: July 21, 2006 Page

For the economic and social dimension, the BSMP considered collecting data on costs and earnings from businesses depending on recreational consumptive use and measuring the knowledge, attitudes and perceptions of recreational users' medium priority.

Data on costs and earnings, employment and other characteristics can be collected to ascertain economic and social effects of MPAs on fishery participants and fishing operations (medium priority). The BSMP determined that socioeconomic data on coastal communities should not be a priority; however, impacts can be measured by analyzing linkages between resource users and coastal communities.

Management and Enforcement Monitoring

The framework for the evaluation of Management and Enforcement is provided by the Regional MPA Management Plan. The Plan is the guide for implementation and a measure of performance is implementation relative to the Plan.

The Management Plan includes the following elements:

1. Introduction ("Why?" and "Where?")
 - a. Description of region
 - b. Regional design and implementation considerations
 - c. Regional goals, and objectives
 - d. Description of individual MPA boundaries (including maps), regulations, and objectives
2. General Activities and Locations ("What?" and "Where?")
 - a. Scientific Monitoring and Research plan
 - b. Outreach, Interpretation and Education plan
 - c. Enforcement plan
 - d. Contingencies and Emergency Planning
3. Operations ("How?")
 - a. Equipment and Facilities
 - b. Staffing
 - c. Collaborations and Potential Partnerships
4. Costs and Funding ("How Much?")
 - a. Estimated costs
 - b. Potential funding sources
5. Timelines and Milestones ("When?")
 - a. Timeline and Criteria for Implementation
 - b. Timeline for Evaluation and Review of Effectiveness

Evaluation of management performance should consider the nature and extent of work performed to implement each program activity, specifically: 1) scientific monitoring; 2) outreach, interpretation and education; 3) enforcement; and 4) contingency and emergency planning. The descriptions of program elements should include information on equipment and facilities; staff and budget; collaborators, partners, and stakeholder involvement; as well as the timelines and milestones that have or have not been met.

Deleted: Placeholder to include specifics on materials (e.g., pamphlets, brochures), signage, and educational programs.¶

Deleted: ¶
In order to facilitate enforcement, the Department proposes using a multi-tiered effort that targets high risk areas (areas prone to infractions) with higher levels of enforcement while maintaining sufficient enforcement in all MPAs. In certain areas, formal and informal partnerships will be relied upon to increase the number of "eyes-on-the-water", person-hours of enforcement, and visibility of enforcement personnel. In some cases, formal memoranda of understanding (MOUs) will be developed to allow fund transfer between partner agencies.¶

¶
Table 6 lists each MPA in the central coast region along with enforcement considerations. Staff needs to implement this plan are discussed in subsection 8.4.3.¶

¶
Table 6. Enforcement considerations for central coast region MPAs.¶
MPA Name ... [87]

Deleted: Placeholder to discuss contingencies for natural disasters and/or unforeseen changes in local conditions.¶

¶
8.4.3.

Deleted: Placeholder to detail equipment and facilities needs beyond existing resources.¶

¶
Deleted: Placeholder to discuss staffing needs.¶

¶
Deleted: Placeholder to discuss potential partnerships.¶
¶
8.4.4.

Deleted: ¶

Deleted: Placeholder for monitoring and management budget.¶

¶
Deleted: Placeholder to describe

Deleted: July 21, 2006 Page

The evaluation of program elements should consider implementation relative to regional goals and objectives, as well goals and objectives in individual activity plans (e.g., the scientific monitoring plan). The effect of staffing and budget on implementation should also be evaluated. To determine if central coast MPAs are operating as a network component, and if the regional network is operating as part of a statewide network, implementation should be evaluated for consistency within the regional and statewide system. Inconsistencies should be explained.

Although management and enforcement will begin with implementation, time is needed to create an operational history. To have sufficient information, management and enforcement should be evaluated 5 years after implementation.

Indicators for all program elements include extent of implementation and extent of stakeholder and public involvement. Indicators specific to program elements follow.

One indicator for the first program element “scientific monitoring” is the availability of information for adaptive management. The description of scientific monitoring should include program objectives, use of the data for evaluation of regional and MPA-specific goals and objectives, and use of the data for adaptive management. Data gaps should be identified, and availability and use of the data by stakeholders, researchers, and other outside entities described.

Indicators for the second program element “outreach, interpretation, and education” include distribution of materials explaining the regulations, understanding and acceptance of the regulations, distribution of educational materials, the presence of interpretive signs, and extent of stakeholder involvement. The description of outreach, interpretation, and education should include use of the materials by stakeholders and other groups, as well as a measure of stakeholder understanding of the materials.

Indicators for the third program element “enforcement” include clearly defined enforcement procedures, enforcement coverage, and information dissemination to encourage compliance. The description of enforcement should include the number and extent of patrols, citations, and contacts with users.

Indicators for the fourth program element “contingency and emergency planning” include speed of response and presence of residual problems. The description of emergency responses should include an evaluation of the availability of resources and lessons learned.

Evaluation of the Network Design

Monitoring to evaluate the execution of the guidelines is discussed in this section. Monitoring to evaluate the management of the network or network component is discussed in the section “Management and Enforcement Monitoring” and monitoring to evaluate biological properties of the network or network component is discussed in “Biophysical Monitoring”.

Deleted: July 21, 2006 Page

Data Management, Assessment and Communication

To assure data quality and integrity, quality assurance/quality control (QA/QC) procedures will be needed from field sampling to data analysis. Where appropriate, sampling equipment needs to be calibrated and tested prior to use. When sampling at sea, limits need to be set on operating conditions (e.g., wave height, water clarity) to provide for safety of the crew and to assure data quality and consistency. Data entered into electronic format should be double checked. Data in electronic format should be verified with range checks and other tests of reasonableness. QA/QC procedures and operations should be documented.

QA/QC is also needed to assure data consistency, particularly when data are collected by separate programs. Sampling methods need to be standardized. Sampling protocols should be written in detail and distributed to all survey participants. Field notes, ship logs, and other records need to be kept to demonstrate that protocols were followed; deviations in protocols need to be documented. In some instances, it may be necessary to conduct inter-calibrations to measure data consistency among participants.

Scientific and public review will also be needed. It is expected that stakeholder and scientific advisory groups will be involved in monitoring, data analysis and evaluation.

Outreach, Interpretation and Education plan

The Department will hire a full-time outreach and education specialist to address a variety of Marine outreach needs, including MLPA. Additionally entry level staff will be hired in each region who will help implement outreach plans and provided direct contact with various user groups in the field. Programs may be developed to provide volunteer and cooperative outreach support and will be described as they are identified.

As specific outreach materials and programs are developed, details will be added to this document. Funding for outreach may come from the California Ocean Protection Council through bond funds received in the 2007/2008 budget cycle.

Enforcement plan

In order to facilitate enforcement, the Department proposes using a multi-tiered effort that targets high risk areas (areas prone to infractions) with higher levels of enforcement while maintaining sufficient enforcement in all MPAs. In certain areas, formal and informal partnerships will be relied upon to increase the number of “eyes-on-the-water”, person-hours of enforcement, and visibility of enforcement personnel. In some cases, formal memoranda of understanding (MOUs) will be developed to allow fund transfer between partner agencies.

Table 18 lists each MPA in the central coast region along with enforcement considerations. Staff needs to implement this plan are discussed in subsection 8.4.3.

Deleted: July 21, 2006 Page

Table 18. Enforcement considerations for central coast region MPAs.

<u>MPA Name</u>	<u>Primary Enforcement Method</u>	<u>Potential Partnerships/ Assistance</u>	<u>Special Considerations</u>	<u>Special Equipment Needs</u>
<u>Año Nuevo SMR</u>	<u>Ocean/Vessel patrol with some shoreline patrol</u>	<u>California State Parks</u>	<u>14 to 16 miles to get patrol skiff to the area. Large Patrol vessel is about 25 miles away.</u>	<u>Boat launch at Año Nuevo-need to be able to trailer small boat closer to the area. Some aircraft patrol.</u>
<u>Greyhound Rock SMCA</u>	<u>Ocean/Vessel patrol with some shoreline patrol</u>		<u>Same issues as Año Nuevo</u>	<u>Same issues as Año Nuevo</u>
<u>Elkhorn Slough SMR</u>	<u>Shoreline patrol with some small skiff patrol</u>	<u>Elkhorn Slough Foundation, NOAA/Elkhorn Slough National Estuarine Research Reserve</u>		<u>Boats</u>
<u>Elkhorn Slough SMP</u>	<u>Shoreline patrol with some small skiff patrol</u>	<u>Elkhorn Slough Foundation, NOAA/Elkhorn Slough National Estuarine Research Reserve</u>		<u>Boats</u>
<u>Moro Cojo Estuary SMR</u>	<u>Shoreline patrol with some small skiff patrol</u>	<u>Elkhorn Slough Foundation, NOAA/Elkhorn Slough National Estuarine Research Reserve</u>		
<u>Soquel Canyon SMCA</u>	<u>Ocean/Vessel patrol</u>	<u>Monterey Bay Marine Sanctuary</u>	<u>Heavily fished area - will require extensive on water patrol.</u>	<u>Small skiff and large boat patrol. Some aircraft patrol.</u>
<u>Portuguese Ledge SMCA</u>	<u>Ocean/Vessel patrol</u>	<u>Monterey Bay Marine Sanctuary</u>	<u>Not connected to shore - requires boat patrol</u>	<u>Small skiff and large boat patrol. Some aircraft patrol.</u>
<u>Ed Ricketts SMCA</u>	<u>Shoreline patrol and some boat patrol</u>	<u>Coast Guard, Monterey and Pacific Grove Police Departments, Monterey Bay Aquarium and Hopkins Marine Station, Monterey Bay Marine Sanctuary</u>	<u>Heavily used area. Many non-consumptive users.</u>	<u>Small boat patrol.</u>
<u>Lovers Point SMR</u>	<u>Shoreline patrol and small skiff patrol</u>	<u>Stanford University/Hopkins Marine Station, Monterey Bay Aquarium, Coast Guard, Monterey Police Department, Monterey Bay Marine Sanctuary</u>	<u>Heavily used area. Many non-consumptive users.</u>	<u>Boats</u>
<u>Pacific Grove SMCA</u>	<u>Shoreline patrol and small skiff patrol</u>	<u>State Parks, Monterey Bay Sanctuary, Pacific Grove PD, Coast Guard</u>	<u>Heavily used area. Many non-consumptive users.</u>	<u>Boats</u>
<u>Carmel Pinnacles SMR</u>	<u>Ocean/Vessel patrol</u>	<u>Monterey Bay Sanctuary</u>		

Deleted: July 21, 2006 Page

<u>MPA Name</u>	<u>Primary Enforcement Method</u>	<u>Potential Partnerships/ Assistance</u>	<u>Special Considerations</u>	<u>Special Equipment Needs</u>
<u>Carmel Bay SMCA</u>	<u>Shoreline patrol and Ocean/Vessel patrol</u>	<u>Monterey Bay Sanctuary. Carmel PD</u>		<u>Boats</u>
<u>Point Lobos SMR</u>	<u>Shoreline patrol and Ocean/Vessel patrol</u>	<u>California State Parks. Monterey Bay Sanctuary.</u>	<u>High use area for divers.</u>	<u>Boats</u>
<u>Point Lobos SMCA</u>	<u>Ocean/Vessel patrol</u>	<u>California State Parks. Monterey Bay Sanctuary.</u>		<u>Boats</u>
<u>Point Sur SMR</u>	<u>Ocean/Vessel patrol with some shoreline patrol</u>	<u>Coast Guard</u>	<u>Distance from harbor. Weather hampers ability to patrol area by boat.</u>	<u>Large and small boats for patrol. Aircraft patrol</u>
<u>Point Sur SMCA</u>	<u>Ocean/Vessel patrol</u>	<u>Coast Guard</u>	<u>Distance from harbor. Weather hampers ability to patrol area by boat.</u>	<u>Large and small boats for patrol. Aircraft patrol</u>
<u>Big Creek SMCA</u>	<u>Ocean/Vessel patrol</u>		<u>Remote area. Only large boat patrol can patrol area.</u>	<u>Large patrol boat and aircraft.</u>
<u>Big Creek SMR</u>	<u>Shoreline patrol and Ocean/Vessel patrol</u>	<u>University of California/Big Creek Reserve</u>	<u>Remote area. Only large boat patrol can patrol area.</u>	<u>Large patrol boat and aircraft.</u>
<u>Piedras Blancas SMR</u>	<u>Shoreline patrol and Ocean/Vessel patrol</u>		<u>Fairly remote</u>	<u>Small and large patrol boats and aircraft.</u>
<u>Piedras Blancas SMCA</u>	<u>Ocean/Vessel patrol</u>		<u>Fairly remote</u>	<u>Small and large patrol boats and aircraft.</u>
<u>Cambria SMR</u>	<u>Shoreline patrol with some boat patrol</u>	<u>University of California/Ken Norris Rancho Marino Reserve</u>		<u>Boats</u>
<u>Morro Bay SMRMA</u>	<u>Shoreline patrol with some small boat patrol.</u>	<u>State Parks.</u>	<u>Multi use area with hunting, fishing, and non consumptive users.</u>	<u>Boats</u>
<u>Morro Bay SMR</u>	<u>Shoreline patrol with small and large boat patrol</u>	<u>California State Parks</u>		
<u>Point Buchon SMR</u>	<u>Ocean/Vessel patrol with shoreline patrol</u>	<u>California State Parks</u>	<u>Diablo Canyon Power Plant proximity.</u>	<u>Large and small patrol boats</u>
<u>Point Buchon SMCA</u>	<u>Ocean/Vessel patrol</u>		<u>Diablo Canyon Power Plant proximity.</u>	<u>Large and small patrol boats</u>
<u>Vandenberg SMR</u>	<u>Shoreline patrol and Ocean/Vessel patrol</u>	<u>Vandenberg Air Force Base</u>	<u>Access to Vandenberg for shoreline patrol. Limited patrol by aircraft</u>	<u>Large and small patrol boats</u>

Deleted: July 21, 2006 Page

Enforcement Personnel

Table 19 Central coast enforcement personnel with marine emphasis (August 2006).

<u>Pigeon Point to Big Sur</u>		<u>Big Sur to Point Conception</u>		<u>Total</u>
<u>Land Based</u>	<u>Patrol Boat</u>	<u>Land Based</u>	<u>Patrol Boat</u>	
<u>1 Lt. / 2 Wardens</u>	<u>1 Lt. / 2 Wardens</u>	<u>2 Wardens</u>	<u>2 Lt. / 4 Wardens</u>	<u>4 Lieutenants</u>
	<u>1 patrol boat</u>		<u>2 patrol boats</u>	<u>10 Wardens</u>

The Department has 14 marine emphasis enforcement staff located within the central coast project covering the area between Pigeon Point and Point Conception. The four lieutenants and ten wardens have a primary emphasis of at sea and shore based marine patrol within this large area. There are also inland wardens that work the non-marine issues along the same area of the central coast. These wardens deal with all inland hunting, fishing, pollution, habitat loss, and other related enforcement issues. This small group of marine emphasis and land based wardens will not be able to adequately handle the added responsibilities of enforcement of these MPAs without assistance. Currently the Law Enforcement Division has 65 vacant positions and is unable to redirect enforcement personnel or current new hires to a new mandate.

The 2006/2007 Governors Budget allowed the Department to create nine new enforcement positions (including engineer positions) to assist with MLPA, MLMA, and Halibut Trawl Bill implementation. These positions cannot be filled, trained, and deployed until at least September of 2008. Until that time, the Department will not implement identified patrol efforts in most of the new MPAs along the central coast.

The Department will be unable to fill enforcement positions designated to MLPA enforcement until it acquires a new hiring list in 2007. The hiring process includes testing, background investigation, hiring, and training. This process takes 18 to 24 months to bring a new warden into the field. The Department is having a difficult time with recruitment and retention of wardens due to salary disparities with other law enforcement agencies. Our warden recruitment is not currently able to keep up with attrition due to retirements and separations. Unless the problem with recruitment and retention is fixed, we may have difficulties placing wardens into these new MLPA positions in the foreseeable future.

Current MPA enforcement will be accomplished using existing personnel resources. Positions cannot be redirected to concentrate on MLPA enforcement due to duties and responsibilities currently facing enforcement. The Department will use MLPA funding to pay overtime to existing wardens to patrol these new areas. Current enforcement staff on the central coast will be supplemented by wardens to assist with patrol effort within the MPAs through directed enforcement details paid through MPA funding.

MPA's will be patrolled by many techniques including large patrol boats, small patrol skiffs, aircraft, and by wardens on the coast. Each MPA has special needs requiring specialized patrol efforts. Areas closer to ports will require less effort to get to, but because of their proximity to population centers, will have a higher use than remote areas. Remote areas may get fewer users, but require a more significant travel. This last patrol would include large boat or aircraft patrol.

Deleted: July 21, 2006 Page

Training

Coastal Wardens working within the central coast area of California will receive training on the new suite of marine protected areas in their patrol districts. This training will include but is not limited to area boundaries and area specific regulations.

Timeline for Implementation of New Enforcement Staff

Enforcement of MPAs in the central coast project will be implemented in phases as DFG enforcement staff levels are augmented to handle the extra work load created by these new MPAs.

Year One (2006-2007)

The Department filled the first of nine new enforcement positions as a Captain in January of 2007. The new MLPA Captain will work closely with department staff in implementing the option approved by the Commission in April of 2007. This Captain will also be closely involved in second round of MLPA initiative in the North Central Coast. As the next eight MLPA positions are filled, this captain will supervise the MLPA enforcement effort in the central coast area.

Start the hiring process for the nine new enforcement positions authorized by the 2006/2007 budget. If no problems are encountered in the hiring process, the Department expects these wardens to be in the field by the end 2008. One to two years are required to complete the hiring process and training to bring a new warden into the field. The ability to hire and train new staff is dependent on State budget, hiring constraints, and academy availability.

During the first year, enforcement will be done with existing DFG enforcement staff. Wardens will receive training on the new MPA boundaries and regulations. Generally speaking, MPAs close in proximity to existing staff will get more patrol effort than those areas that are more remote. The Department will direct our effort mainly to MPAs with high use or sensitivity during the first year.

Because of limited staff near the MPA's, DFG will initiate directed patrols to increase visibility and decrease unauthorized user impacts. Directed patrols will be conducted intermittently and can be initiated for a number of reasons.

Year one's enforcement effort should be projected to be moderate due to staffing levels and other mandates. DFG will direct patrol efforts toward these MPAs, with the understanding that redirection of existing enforcement staff from their current duties is not an option. Overtime and directed patrols will augment available MPA enforcement. MPAs close to ports will routinely see more effort than the MPAs that are more remote. DFG will implement increased MPA patrol efforts as new positions are established and filled.

Year Two (2007-2008)

Continue with the hiring process for the nine positions authorized in the 2006/2007 budget.

Deleted: July 21, 2006 Page

Continue to patrol MPAs with existing enforcement staff as described in year one.

Late in year two, assuming the recruitment and retention problems are solved, the Department should have the first group of wardens filling the MPA funded positions. These wardens will be assigned coastal positions between Pigeon Point and Point Conception. Four wardens would be assigned between Pigeon Point and Big Sur, and four wardens between Big Sur and Point Conception. The eight wardens would be supervised by one lieutenant located in the Monterey Bay area. These wardens will be MPA emphasis wardens, but will also be involved with other DFG enforcement patrols and priorities.

These wardens will offer an increased level of service and patrol in the MPAs. The patrol efforts in all of the MPAs will see significant increase, especially areas that are more remote where minimal patrol effort was seen in year one. MPAs near ports will receive a significant boost in patrol effort as a result of these new positions. These wardens will work closely with other DFG wardens and utilize other DFG staff as needed and available to assist with MPA enforcement. Directed enforcement patrols and details will continue to be utilized to infiltrate problem areas and work identified issues.

Additional DFG Enforcement Resources

DFG has three large patrol boats in the 54 to 65 foot class stationed at major ports along the central coast. Each large patrol boat is staffed by one lieutenant and two wardens. DFG also has a fleet of single and twin engine fixed wing aircraft that work in conjunction with both marine and land based wardens to help identify and investigate violations.

Contingencies and Emergency Planning

Details on contingencies for natural disasters and/or unforeseen changes in local conditions will be added if necessary.

8.4.3. Operations

Equipment and Facilities

At this point, no additional equipment or facilities have been identified that are necessary to the successful implementation of MPAs in the central coast region.

Staffing

Based on staff positions received in the 2006/2007 State budget, the Department hired a management/policy level staff person to oversee implementation of the central coast MPAs and planning in subsequent study regions. Ten of the other new positions have been hired to assist with planning in the next study region. These staff included a range of expertise and classifications from entry level data collection and analysis to specialist and supervisory level planning staff. The staff form the core of a new Department Marine Region project focused solely on MPA planning issues.

In addition to the above, staff have been added to existing Department Marine Region projects with duties that will include implementation of the central coast MPAs in addition to implementation and ongoing management under the scope of the Marine Life Management

Deleted: July 21, 2006 Page

Act. Examples of projects that have new staff include: groundfish management; bay and estuary management; invertebrate management; state finfish management and state fishery review; research vessel operations; and fishery independent data collection. All of these staff perform duties which support a range of Department priorities, including MPA monitoring, management and implementation.

Enforcement staffing and implementation concerns are discussed in section 8.4.2 above.

Collaborations and Potential Partnerships

Collaboration will be particularly important in monitoring and evaluation. Collaboration can build financial, institutional and intellectual synergies, producing more with better results. Academic institutions and governmental agencies have ongoing monitoring programs that will provide valuable data. Volunteer programs are being developed and have the potential to greatly augment the scope of sampling. Commercial and recreational fishermen have in-depth, personal knowledge that can inform all aspects of monitoring. It will be desirable to work with commercial fishermen who have boats and fishing gear as well as specialized knowledge of fishing that will be needed to conduct some of the monitoring proposed in this plan. Cooperative sampling will be an integral part of this monitoring program and sampling will build upon existing programs as much as possible. Existing data and potential for collaboration are presented below in Table 20.

Table 20. Existing data collection efforts which may provide information or potential collaboration in the Central Coast study region.

<u>Organization</u>	<u>Sampling occurs with in study region</u>	<u>Sample sites within MPAs</u>	<u>Long term monitoring</u>	<u>zone</u>	<u>comments</u>
<u>PISCO</u>	<u>X</u>	<u>X</u>	<u>X</u>	<u>Shallow subtidal</u>	<u>Standardized, surveys fish, macro-invertebrates, algae, substrate type, relief, benthic cover</u>
<u>Reef Check</u>	<u>X</u>	<u>X</u>	<u>X</u>	<u>Shallow subtidal</u>	<u>Modified PISCO/CRANE protocol, will be comparable to PISCO/CRANE at some resolutions</u>
<u>REEF</u>			<u>X</u>	<u>Shallow subtidal</u>	<u>Uses timed swims instead of transects – would provide community composition information</u>
<u>MARINe</u>	<u>X</u>	<u>X</u>	<u>X</u>	<u>Rocky intertidal</u>	<u>Rocky intertidal surveys, uses indicator species, uses combination of photo quadrats, transects, and timed searches</u>
<u>LIMPETS</u>	<u>X</u>			<u>Rocky intertidal</u>	<u>Samples 4 sites, transects, quadrats</u>
<u>NMFS and MBNMS</u>					<u>Marine mammal surveys, seabirds, spans very large geographic areas</u>
<u>USGS</u>					<u>Sea otters, aerial and shore-based surveys</u>
<u>UCSC</u>			<u>X</u>		<u>Elephant seals in MBNMS</u>
<u>Moss Landing Elkhorn Slough</u>	<u>X</u>	<u>X</u>		<u>estuary</u>	<u>Shorebirds, harbor seals, sea otters in Elkhorn Slough</u>
<u>National Estuarine Research</u>	<u>X</u>	<u>X</u>		<u>estuary</u>	<u>Shorebirds and rookeries, water samples, crab, gaper clams, some other invertebrates</u>

Deleted: July 21, 2006 Page

Reserve
program
Morro Bay
National
Estuary
program and
PRBO

X

estuary

Seabird abundance, breeding
performance and diet at Año Nuevo, eel
grass

Deleted: July 21, 2006 Page

8.4.4. Costs and Funding

Estimated costs

Preliminary cost estimates of baseline monitoring are provided in section 8.4.2 above.

Potential funding sources

Funding to initiate MPA related monitoring was provided to the Department and California Ocean Protection Council in the 2006/2007 State budget. These funds will primarily be used to support baseline monitoring programs. Long-term funding sources will be described as they become available and are identified.

Deleted: .

Page Break

8.4.5. Timelines and Milestones

Timeline and Criteria for Implementation

The Commission will make a final determination on regulations for new MPAs in the central coast region in April 2007. Upon adoption of regulations, final Administrative Procedure Act documents will be prepared and submitted to the Office of Administrative Law (OAL). OAL may take up to 30 working days to review these documents and the regulatory adoption process. If approved by OAL, the regulations are submitted to the Secretary of State and become effective 30 days later.

Deleted: Placeholder¶

Timeline for Evaluation and Review of Effectiveness

Once data on the effects of MPAs have been obtained, they can then be evaluated with respect to data collected in other California and worldwide MPAs to determine if the intended goals have been achieved. The evaluation of these data along with a statement of statistical confidence determines the MPAs effectiveness.

Since most biological responses will lag behind the change in protection, minimum time limits must be established. These minimum limits should allow sufficient time for change to occur and for planned monitoring to detect this change with statistical significance. To meet the ongoing needs of an adaptive management process, however, it is also necessary to establish upper time limits. Upper time limits ensure the MPAs will be reviewed in a reasonable amount of time.

Though some changes may be very rapid, most will take many years to accrue, especially given the biology of fish and invertebrate species in the region. In order to allow the process of adaptive management to continue, however, review cannot be put off indefinitely. Thus, it is recommended that a major review of this monitoring program's results occur approximately five years after reserve implementation. Interim annual reviews should highlight success or failure of the monitoring itself as well as data which show more instantaneous changes, such as landings and income from fisheries.

8.5: South Coast Region (Point Conception to U.S./Mexico Border)

Timeline to be Determined

Deleted: Proposed

Deleted: ¶
Convene Stakeholder Working Group - January 2007¶
Complete Working Group Process - December 2007¶
Prepare Final Proposals

Deleted: Commission - January 2008 to March 2008¶
Planned Completion (begin Commission consideration process) - April 2008

Deleted: July 21, 2006 Page

- ^ECoombs, C. I. 1979. Reef fishes near Depoe Bay, Oregon: movement and the recreational fishery. MS thesis, Oregon State University, Corvallis.
- ^ECulver, B. N. 1987. Results from tagging black rockfish (*Sebastes melanops*) off the Washington and northern Oregon coast. Pages 231-240 in Proceedings of the international rockfish symposium. University of Alaska Sea Grant Report 87-2, Fairbanks.
- ^EDark, T.A. (ed.). 1985. Pacific whiting: the resource, industry, and management history. Marine Fisheries Review 47(2):1-98.
- ^BEckert, G. L., Effects of the planktonic period on marine population fluctuations. Ecology: Vol. 84, 2:372–383.
- Gell, F.R., and C.M. Roberts. 2003. Benefits beyond boundaries: the fishery effects of marine reserves. Trends in Ecology & Evolution 18:448-455.
- ^FGraham, W.M., and J.L. Largier. 1997. Upwelling shadows as nearshore retention sites: the example of northern Monterey Bay. Continental Shelf Research 17(5): 509-532.
- ^EGrantham, B.A., G.L. Eckert and A.L. Shanks. 2003. Dispersal potential of marine invertebrates in diverse habitats. Ecological Applications 13:S108-S116.
- Green, R.H. 1979. Sampling Design and Statistical Methods for Environmental Biologists. John Wiley and Sons, New York. 257 pp.
- ^EHallacher, L. E. 1984. Relocation of original territories by displaced black-and-yellow rockfish, *Sebastes chrysomelas*, from Carmel Bay, California. Calif. Fish and Game Bull. 70(3):158-162.
- ^DHalpern, B. 2003. The impact of marine reserves: Do reserves work and does reserve size matter? Ecological Applications 13(1) Supplement: S117-137.
- Halpern, B.S. and R.R. Warner. 2003 Matching marine reserve design to reserve objectives. Proceedings of the Royal Society of London - Series B; Biological Sciences. 270(1527). 22 September 2003. 1871-1878.
- ^EHartman, A. R. 1987. Movement of scorpionfishes (Scorpaenidae: *Sebastes* and *Scorpaena*) in the southern California Bight. Calif. Fish and Game Bull. 73(2):68-79.
- ^EHaugen, C.W. (ed.). 1990. The California halibut, *Paralichthys californicus*, resource and fisheries. California Department of Fish & Game Fish Bulletin 174.
- ^EHeilprin, D. J. 1992. The role of olfaction in the homing ability of the blue rockfish, *Sebastes mystinus*, in Carmel Bay, California. MS Thesis, Moss Landing Marine Laboratories, San Jose State University. 63 pp.
- Hickey, B.M., 1979: The California Current System-Hypotheses and facts. Progress in Oceanography, Vol. 8, 191-279.

Deleted: July 21, 2006 Page

Hickey, B.M., 1998: Western North America, Tip of Baja California to Vancouver Island. In: Robinson, Allan R. and Brink, Kenneth H., The Sea, Wiley, New York, pp. 345-393.

Hilborn, R., K. Stokes, J.J. Maguire, T. Smith, L.W. Botsford, J. Mangel, J. Orensanz, A. Parma, J. Rice, J. Bell, K.L. Cochrane, S. Garcia, S.J. Hall, G.P. Kirkwood, K. Sainsbury, G. Stefansson, and C. Walters. 2004. When can marine reserves improve fisheries management? *Ocean & Coastal Management* 47:197-205.

Hixon, M.A. and B.N. Tissot. 2007. Comparison of trawled vs untrawled mud seafloor assemblages of fish and macroinvertebrates at Coquille Bank, Oregon. *J. of Exp. Mar. Biol. Ecol.* In Press.

^EHorton, H.F. 1989. Species profiles: Life histories and environmental requirements of coastal fishes and invertebrates (Pacific Northwest) - Dover and rock sole. Biological Report, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 17 pp.

^AHyrenbach, D.K., K.A. Forney, P.K. Dayton. Marine protected areas and ocean basin management. *Aquatic Conservation: Marine and Freshwater Ecosystems* 10(6): 437-458.

^EIanelli, J.N., R. Lauth, and L.D. Jacobson. 1994. Status of the thornyhead (*Sebastolobus* sp.) resource in 1994. National Marine Fisheries Service, Alaska Fisheries Science Center. 58 pp.

Jackson, J.B.C., M.X. Kirby, W.H. Berger, K.A. Bjorndal, L.W. Botsford, B.J. Bourque, R.H. Bradbury, R. Cooke, J. Erlandson, J.A. Estes, T.P. Hughes, S. Kidwell, C.B. Lange, and R.R. Warner. 2001. Historical Overfishing and the Recent Collapse of Coastal Ecosystems. *Science*. 293:629-637.

^EJagiello, T.H. 1990. Movement of tagged lingcod *Ophiodon elongatus* at Neah Bay, Washington. *Fish. Bull.* 88(4):815-820.

Jones, P.J.S. 1994. A review and analysis of the objectives of marine nature reserves. *Ocean and Coastal Management* 22(3): 149-178.

^AJones, P. J. S. 2002. Marine protected area strategies: issues, divergences and the search for middle ground. *Reviews in Fish Biology and Fisheries*. 11: 197-216.

^EKarpov, K. A., D. P. Albin, and W. H. VanBuskirk. 1995. The marine recreational finfishery in northern and central California: Historical comparison (1958-1986), status of stocks (1980-1986), and effects of changes in the California Current. Bulletin Number 176 of the California Department of Fish and Game.

Kelleher, G., C. Bleahey, and S. Wells. 1995. A Global Representative System of Marine Protected Areas. Washington, D.C.: World Bank.

Kelleher, G, editor. 1999. Guidelines for Marine Protected Areas. Wales, UK: IUCN.http://www.iucn.org/themes/wcpa/pubs/pdfs/mpa_guidelines.pdf.

Deleted: July 21, 2006 Page

National Fisheries Conservation Center (NFCC). 2004. Integrating Marine Reserve Science and Fishery Management. in NFCC Consensus Conference. <http://nfcc-fisheries.org/consensus/>.

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), National Marine Sanctuary Program. 2002. National Marine Sanctuary Management Plan Handbook, 3rd Edition, Silver Springs, Maryland.

National Research Council (NRC). 1990. Managing Troubled Waters: The Role of Marine Environmental Monitoring. Washington, DC: National Academy Press. 125 pp.

National Research Council (NRC). 1995. Understanding Marine Biodiversity: A Research Agenda for the Nation. National Academy Press, Washington, D.C.

^{A,C}National Research Council (NRC). 2001. Marine protected areas: Tools for sustaining ocean ecosystems. National Academy Press, Washington, D.C.

^ANational Research Council (NRC). 2005. Understanding Marine Biodiversity. National Academy of Sciences. Washington, D.C.

[Nasby-Lucas, N.M., B.W. Embly, M.A. Hixon, S.G. Merle, B.n. Tissot, and D.J. Wright. 2002. Integration of submersible transect data and high-resolution multibeam sonar imagery for a habitat-based groundfish assessment of Hecata Bank, Oregon. Fish. Bull. 100:739-751.](#)

Nowlis, J.S. and A. Friedlander. 2004. Design and Designation of Marine Reserves, in Marine Reserves: A Guide to Science, Design, and Use, Sobel S and Dahlgren C, Eds. Island Press, Washington, DC.

Office of Management and Budget (OMB). 2004. Final Information Quality Bulletin for Peer Review. December 4, 2004. (Accessed 24 March 2004) http://www.thecre.com/pdf/peer_bulletin.pdf.

^EPalumbi, S. R. 2003. Population genetics, demographic connectivity and the design of marine reserves. Ecological Applications. 13:S146-S158.

Parrish, R.R. and M.J. Tegner. 2001. California's Variable Ocean Environment, in California's Living Marine Resources: A Status Report, Leet, W.S., Dewees, C.M., Klingbeil, R., and Larson, E.J., Eds. California Department of Fish and Game. Pages 21-28.

^EPearcy, W.G. 1992. Movements of acoustically-tagged yellowtail rockfish *Sebastes flavidus* on Heceta Bank, Oregon. Fish. Bull. 90:726-735.

^EPereyra, W.T., W.G. Pearcy, and F.E. Carvey, Jr. 1969. *Sebastes flavidus*, a shelf rockfish feeding on mesopelagic fauna, with consideration of the ecological implications. J. Fish. Res. Bd. Can. 26:2211-2215.

Deleted: July 21, 2006 Page

^EShanks, A.L., B. Grantham, and M.H. Carr. 2003. Propagule dispersal distance and the size and spacing of marine reserves. *Ecological Applications* 13:S159-169.

^FService, S.K., J.A. Rice, and F. P. Chavez. 1998. Relationship between physical and biological variables during the upwelling period in Monterey Bay, California. *Deep-Sea Research Part II* 45: 1669-1685.

Sheehan, L. and R. Tasto. 2001. The Status of Habitats and Water Quality in California's Coastal and Marine Environment, in *California's Living Marine Resources: A Status Report*, Leet, W.S., Dewees, C.M., Klingbeil, R., and Larson, E.J., Eds. California Department of Fish and Game. Pages 29-45.

^ESmith, S.E. and N. Abramson. 1990. Leopard shark *Triakis semifasciata* distribution, mortality rate, yield, and stock replenishment estimates based on a tagging study in San Francisco Bay. *U.S. Fishery Bulletin* 88(2):371-381.

^EStanley, R. D., B. M. Leaman, L. Haldorson, and V. M. O'Connell. 1994. Movements of tagged adult yellowtail rockfish, *Sebastes flavidus*, off the west coast of North America. *Fish. Bull.* 92:655-663.

^DStarr, R.M., V. O'Connell, and S. Ralston. 2004. Movements of lingcod (*Ophiodon elongatus*) in southeast Alaska: potential for increased conservation and yield from marine reserves. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences*. 61:1083-1094.

^EStarr, R.M., J.N. Heine, J.M. Felton, and G.M. Cailliet. 2002. Movements of bocaccio (*Sebastes paucispinis*) and greenspotted (*Sebastes chlorostictus*) rockfishes in a Monterey submarine canyon: Implications for the design of marine reserves. *Fishery Bulletin* Vol. 100, No. 2. pp. 324-337.

^EStarr, R.M., J.N. Heine, and K.A. Johnson. 2000. *In situ* techniques for tagging and tracking rockfishes. *North American Journal of Fisheries Management*, Vol. 20:597-609.

^EStarr, R.M. and R.E. Thorne. 1998. Acoustic assessment of squid stocks. pp. 181-198 in: P.G. Rodhouse, E.G. Dawe, and R.K. O'Dor (eds.): *Squid recruitment dynamics: the genus *Illex* as a model, the commercial *Illex* species and influences on variability*. FAO Fish. Tech. Pap. No. 376. Rome, Italy.

^AStevens, T. 2002. Rigor and representativeness in marine protected area design. *Coastal Management*. 30:237-248.

Stewart-Oaten, A. 1986. Problems in the analysis of environmental monitoring data. Pp. 109-132 In Schmitt, R.J., C.W. Osenberg (eds) *Detection of ecological impacts: conceptual issues and application in coastal marine habitats*. Academic Press, San Diego, CA.

^CStoms, D.M., F.W. Davis, S.J. Andelman, M.H Carr, S.D. Gaines, B.S. Halpern, R. Hoenicke, S.G. Leibowitz, A. Leydecker, E.M.P. Madin, H. Tallis, and R.R. Warner. in press. Integrated coastal reserve planning: making the land-sea connection. *Frontiers in Ecology*.

Deleted: July 21, 2006 Page

^FStrub, P.T., P.M. Kosro, and A. Huyer. 1991. The nature of cold filaments in the California Current system. *Journal of Geophysical Research* 96:14743-14768.

[Tenera Environmental, Inc. 1998. Diablo Canyon Power Plant Thermal Effects Monitoring Program analysis report. Chapter 1 – Changes in the marine environment resulting from the Diablo Canyon Power Plant discharge. Pacific Gas and Electric Company, San Francisco, CA.](#)

United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization, Committee on Fisheries (FAO). 2004. Marine protected areas (MPAs) and fisheries. COFI/2005/8.

^EWilkins, M.E. 1996. Long term trends in abundance: Results of triennial bottom trawl surveys of west coast groundfish resources between 1977 and 1995. Alaska Fisheries Science Center, NMFS/NOAA, 7600 Sand Point Way NE, Seattle, Washington 98115.

^EYamanaka, K.L. and L.J. Richards. 1993. Movements of transplanted lingcod, *Ophiodon elongatus*, determined by ultrasonic telemetry. *Fish. Bull.* 91:582-587.

[Yoklavich, M., G. Cailliet, R.N. Lea, H.G. Greene, R. Starr, J. De Marniac, and J. Field. 2002. Deepwater habitat and fish resources associated with the Big Creek Marine Ecological Reserve. CalCOFI Rep. 43:120-140.](#)

[Yoklavich, M., H.G. Greene, G.M. Cailliet, D.E. Sullivan, R.N. Lea, and M.S. Love. 2000. Habitat associations of deep-water rockfishes in a submarine canyon: an example of a natural refuge. Fish. Bull. 98:625-641.](#)

Deleted: July 21, 2006 Page